Digitized by Google

Original from
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

PM2
.M57

Digitized by Google

Original from
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Digitized by Google

Original from
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Digitized by Google

Original from
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

THE
MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW

VOLUME XIX

1924

Digitized by Google

Original from
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
LONDON: FETTER LANE, E.C. 4

CHICAGO: THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
(AGENT FOR THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA)
BOMBAY, CALCUTTA AND MADRAS: MACMILLAN AND CO., LTD
TOKYO: MARUZEN-KABUSHIKI-KAISHA

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Digitized by Google

Original from
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

THE MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW

A QUARTERLY JOURNAL EDITED FOR THE MODERN HUMANITIES RESEARCH ASSOCIATION

BY

J. G. ROBERTSON

G. C. MOORE SMITH

AND

EDMUND G. GARDNER

VOLUME XIX

CAMBRIDGE
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS
1924

Digitized by Google

Original from
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

168281

PM2
.M57

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN

Digitized by Google

Original from
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

CONTENTS

ARTICLES. PAGE

BARKER, MARIE L., Joshua Steele on Speech-Melody (1779) . . . 169
BOSTOCK, J. KNIGHT, Brentano's 'Legende der heiligen Marina' . . 195
BUTLER, E. M., The Persecution of the Young Germans . . . 63
COLLINSON, W. E., The Frisian Poems in Titia Brongersma's 'Bronswaan' 84, 346
DODDS, M. HOPE, 'Edmond Ironside' and 'The Love-sick King' . . 158
FREEMAN, EDMUND, A Proposal for an English Academy in 1660 . . 291
GARDNER, EDMUND G., Notes on the Lyrical Poetry of Dante . . 306
JEFFERY, V. M., Italian and English Pastoral Drama of the Renaissance. I. Source of the 'Complaint of the Satyres against the Nymphes.' II. The Source of Peele's 'Arraignment of Paris.' III. Sources of Daniel's 'Queen's Arcadia' and Randolph's 'Amyntas' . . 56, 175, 435
KRAPPE, ALEXANDER H., The Song of Grotti 325
LABORDE, E. D., The Style of 'The Battle of Maldon' 401
LAWRENCE, W. J., Thomas Ravenscroft's Theatrical Associations . . 418
LAWRENCE, W. J., Was Peter Cunningham a Forger? 25, 344
LEGROS, RENÉ P., André Chénier en Angleterre 424
LEGROS, RENÉ P., Diderot et Shaftesbury 188
ORR, JOHN, Les Nouvelles Lois Phonétiques de Mr Nicholson . . 35
PEERS, E. ALLISON, The Literary Activities of the Spanish 'Emigrados' in England, I, II 315, 445
PRAZ, MARIO, Robert Southwell's 'Saint Peter's Complaint' and its Italian Source 273
STOLL, E. E., Literature no 'Document' 141
SYKES, H. DUGDALE, John Ford, the Author of 'The Spanish Gipsy' . 11
TAYLOR, A. B., On the History of Old English $\overline{ea}$, $\overline{eo}$ in Middle English 1
TOYNBEE, PAGET, Dante Notes 48
TREGENZA, W. A., The Relation of the Oldest Branch of the 'Roman de Renart' to the Tristan Poems 301

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES.

ALLEN, HOPE EMILY, On 'Some Fourteenth-Century Borrowings from Ancren Riwle' 95
BARBIER, PAUL, Latin 'Pardus' and 'Leopardus' in the Popular Nomenclature of Fish 214
BATESON, HARTLEY, Three Notes on the Middle English 'Cleanness' . 95
COLLINSON, W. E., Supplementary Note on 'The Frisian Poems in Titia Brongersma's Bronswaan' 346
CRAWFORD, S. J., The Source of a Passage in Byrhtferd's 'Handboc' (A.D. 1011) 335
DUSTOOR, P. E., The Origin of the Play of 'Moses and the Tables of the Law' 459
ENTWISTLE, WILLIAM J., The Liberation of Castile 471
GREG, W. W., Cini and Boccaccio's 'Genealogia Deorum' . . . 130
GREG, W. W., 'Guy of Warwick' 337
LLOYD, BERTRAM, A Minor Source of 'The Changeling' . . . 101
LLOYD, BERTRAM, 'Scamels' in 'The Tempest' 102
MACKALL, LEONARD L., Coleridge Marginalia on Wieland and Schiller . 344

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES *cont.* PAGE

MENNER, ROBERT J., Notes on 'Sir Gawain and the Green Knight' . 204
MORLEY, EDITH J., A Manuscript Poem of Wordsworth . . . 211
PERRETT, W., Notes on Old High German Texts (Hildebrandslied, Muspilli, Otfrid) 218
REANEY, PERCY H., Essex Place-names in '-ing' 466
REANEY, PERCY H., Mockbeggar Hall 469
SANDBACH, FRANCIS E., A Missing Name in Goethe's Diary . . . 472
SCHÜCKING, LEVIN L., The Fairy Scene in 'The Merry Wives' in Folio and Quarto 338
SEDGWICK, W. B., Chaucer's 'Pardoner's Prologue' 336
SPARROW, JOHN, On the Date of Donne's 'Hymne to God my God, in my Sicknesse' 462
STOPES, CHARLOTTE CARMICHAEL, Mr W. J. Lawrence and Peter Cunningham 340
TAYLOR, A. E., Spenser's Knowledge of Plato 208
TOLLER, T. N., Further Additions to the Supplement of the Bosworth-Toller 'Anglo-Saxon Dictionary' 200

REVIEWS.

Abercrombie, Lascelles, Principles of English Prosody, I (T. B. RUDMOSE-BROWN) 364
Armstrong, Edward C., The French Metrical Versions of Barlaam and Josaphat (M. K. POPE) 489
Atkins, H. G., A History of German Versification (EDNA PURDIE) . 125
Barnard, H. C., The French Tradition in Education (F. C. JOHNSON) . 120
Beatty, A., William Wordsworth (C. H. HERFORD) 113
Bell, A. F. G., Luis de Camões (W. J. ENTWISTLE) 124
Bestrafte Untreue, herausg. von J. Wilks (L. A. WILLOUGHBY) . . 492
Boissonnade, P., Du Nouveau sur la Chanson de Roland (R. FAWTIER) . 235
Bradley, J. F. and J. Q. Adams, The Jonson Allusion-Book (G. C. MOORE SMITH) 111
Busby, O. M., Studies in the Development of the Fool in the Elizabethan Drama (W. W. GREG) 230
Butler, K., A History of French Literature (T. B. RUDMOSE-BROWN) . 368
Cavalier and Puritan: Ballads of 1640–60, ed. by Hyder E. Rollins (A. ESDAILE) 484
Cazamian, M. L., Le Roman et les Idées en Angleterre (C. H. HERFORD) 486
Chambers, E. K., The Elizabethan Stage (ALLARDYCE NICOLL) . . 474
Chaytor, H. J., The Troubadours and England (L. E. KASTNER) . . 353
Crawford, J. P. W., Spanish Drama before Lope de Vega (W. J. ENTWISTLE) 248
Croce, B., Goethe. Transl. into English (EDNA PURDIE) . . . 379
Dibelius, W., England (G. H. COWLING) 367
Dybowski, R., Modern Polish Literary History (MONICA GARDNER) . 383
Dybowski, R., Periods of Polish Literary History (MONICA GARDNER) . 383
Eginhard, Vie de Charlemagne, éd. par L. Halphen (JESSIE CROSLAND) 371
Eloy d'Amerval, Le Liure de la Deablerie, ed. by C. F. Ward (JOHN ORR) 240
Farinelli, A., Dante in Spagna, Francia, Inghilterra, Germania (EDMUND G. GARDNER) 373

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

REVIEWS *cont.* PAGE

Fitzmaurice-Kelly, Julia, Antonio Pérez (W. J. ENTWISTLE) . . . 124
Francke, K., Die Kulturwerte der deutschen Literatur, II (J. G. ROBERTSON) 127
Goethes Faust, herausg. von R. Petsch (J. G. ROBERTSON) . . . 379
Grimm, Briefe der Brüder, herausg. von E. Gürtler und A. Leitzmann (EDNA PURDIE) 251
Groot, H. de, Hamlet: its Textual History (W. W. GREG) . . . 228
Guy of Warwick, herausg. von G. Schleich (G. H. COWLING) . . . 222
Hall, J., Selections from Early Middle English (1130–1250) (R. W. CHAMBERS) 351
Howie, M. D., Studies in the Use of Exempla (L. A. WILLOUGHBY) . 492
Huchon, R., Histoire de la Langue anglaise, I (OTTO JESPERSEN) . . 348
Kalff, G., De Sage van den Vliegenden Hollander (J. G. ROBERTSON) . 381
Ker, W. P., The Art of Poetry (H. V. ROUTH) 361
Krappe, A. H., Alliteration in the Chanson de Roland and Carmen de Prodicione Guenonis (M. K. POPE) 119
Leopardi, The Poems of, ed. by G. L. Bickersteth (EDMUND G. GARDNER) 245
Lull, Ramón, The Book of the Lover and the Beloved, transl. by E. A. Peers (EDMUND G. GARDNER) 246
Montgomery, M., F. Hölderlin and the German Neo-Hellenic Movement, I (J. G. ROBERTSON) 249
Murry, J. H., The Problem of Style (H. V. ROUTH) 363
Pearl, Cleanness, Patience and Sir Gawain, ed. by Sir I. Gollancz (W. W. GREG) 223
Petrarca, F., Epistulae Selectae, ed. A. F. Johnson (H. E. BUTLER) . 491
Ribeiro, B. e C. Falcão, Obras, ed. por A. Braamcamp Freire (AUBREY F. G. BELL) 375
Ritter, O., Vermischte Beiträge zur englischen Sprachgeschichte (ALLEN MAWER) 350
Robertson, J. M., The Shakespeare Canon (H. DUGDALE SYKES) . . 476
Rohan, Die Liederhandschrift des Cardinals, herausg. von M. Löpelmann (JESSIE CROSLAND) 372
Rolandslied, Das, herausg. von E. Lerch (JESSIE CROSLAND) . . . 488
Rollin, H. E., Analytical Index to the Ballad-entries in the Registers of the Company of Stationers (A. ESDAILE) 484
Sapir, E., Language (W. E. COLLINSON) 253
Saussure, F. de, Cours de Linguistique générale (W. E. COLLINSON) . 253
Sedgefield, W. J., An Anglo-Saxon Verse-Book (S. J. CRAWFORD) . . 104
Seifert, E., Die Proparoxytona im Galloromanischen (JOHN ORR) . . 234
Shakespeare, W., Works, III–VI, ed. by Sir A. Quiller-Couch and J. Dover Wilson, III–VI (E. K. CHAMBERS) 108
Shears, F. S., Recherches sur les Prépositions dans la Prose du Moyen Français (F. C. JOHNSON) 117
Smith, H., A Fruitefull Sermon, ed. by H. T. Price (A. W. POLLARD) . 232
Stevens, D. H., Types of English Drama, 1660–1780 (MONTAGUE SUMMERS) 354
Van der Laan, J., A Psychological Basis for the Use of the Progressive Form in Late Modern English (R. B. MCKERROW) 487
Von deutscher Art und Kunst, ed. by E. Purdie (W. E. DELP) . . 493

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

MINOR NOTICES. PAGE

Bach, M. G., Wieland's Attitude towards Women 390
Barnes, H. E., The Variations between the Editions of Balzac's 'Les Chouans' 388
Calina, J., Shakespeare in Poland 129
Carpenter, F. I., Reference Guide to Edmund Spenser 258
Dormer, E. W., Gray of Reading 494
Dudok, G., Sir Thomas More and his Utopia 385
Errante, V., Il Mito di Faust 498
Foundations of St Bartholomew's Church, The, ed. by Sir N. Moore and M. M. Weale 258
Gargàno, G. S., Scapigliatura italiana a Londra sotto Elisabetta e Giacomo I 260
Grøndahl, I. and O. Raknes, Chapters in Norwegian Literature . . 261
Hammerich, L. L., Zur deutschen Akzentuation 130
Herrick, R., Poetical Works, ed. by F. W. Moorman 259
Hittmair, R., Das Zeitwort 'Do' in Chaucers Prosa 256
Horn, W., Sprachkörper und Sprachfunktion 130
Hunt, Leigh, Poetical Works, ed. by H. S. Milford 388
Jespersen, O., Modersmålets Fonetik 130
Jokl, N., Linguistisch-kulturhistorische Untersuchungen aus dem Bereiche des Albanischen 391
Litteris 391
Ludus Coventriae, ed. by K. S. Block 256
Malone, K., The Literary History of Hamlet, I 259
Massey, B. W. A., The Compound Epithets of Shelley and Keats . . 386
Par, Anfós, Sintaxi Catalana 389
Paues, A. C., Bibliography of English Language and Literature, 1922 . 128
Pellizzi, C., Gli Spiriti della vigilia 498
Pepysian Gospel Harmony, The, ed. by M. Goates 257
Pollard, A. W., English Miracle Plays 258
Potts, A. F., The Ecclesiastical Sonnets of Wordsworth 387
Robinson, C. and others, A Handful of Pleasant Delights, ed. by H. E. Rollins 494
Schuchardt, H., Primitiae Linguae Vasconum 390
Shelley, Mary, Proserpine and Midas, ed. by A. Koszul 497
Snyder, E. D., The Celtic Revival in English Literature . . . 496
Thomas of Britain, The Romance of Tristram and Ysolt, transl. by R. S. Loomis 260
Thompson, E. N. S., Literary Bypaths of the Renaissance . . . 495
Wells, J. E., Manual of the Writings in Middle English. Second Supplement. 385
Year's Work in English Studies, The 385

NEW PUBLICATIONS 131, 262, 392, 499

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

VOLUME XIX JANUARY, 1924 NUMBER 1

ON THE HISTORY OF OLD ENGLISH *ĒA*, *ĒO* IN MIDDLE KENTISH.

ALTHOUGH for a considerable time in the Middle English period the Old English diphthongs *ēa*, *ēo* continued to be written in the traditional manner, they were, by the thirteenth century at least, represented fairly generally in most dialects as monophthongs. It is generally considered that they had been completely monophthongised a considerable time before this general change in spelling. Yet in some documents of the south-eastern area, for the most part assumed to be Kentish, these diphthongs appear, not only with the traditional spelling, but even represented by entirely new devices, as late as the fourteenth century. Of these documents—the so-called Kentish version of the *Poema Morale* (Digby MS.), the *Kentish Sermons*, the poems of *William of Shoreham*, and the *Ayenbite of Inwyt*—the last is the only one of which the Kentish origin can be regarded as certain. *William of Shoreham* has been regarded as Kentish, partly because there is a Shoreham in Kent (in spite of the fact that it is not the only one), and partly because its orthography agrees more closely with that of *Ayenbite* than with that of any texts of other dialects. The confused state of the spelling in these poems is such as to yield little valuable evidence either of their own dialect or of the history of sound-change in general. The other two documents have been called Kentish solely because of their agreement in dialectal characteristics with *Ayenbite*. It is necessary to make this statement, in order that, while continuing to regard them as Kentish, we do not lay any definite claim to certainty on this point.

Since the *Ayenbite*, although probably the latest of all (c. 1340), is yet the most archaic in form, discussion has necessarily tended to centre on this one text, from which, owing (1) to the use of *ie* almost exclusively for O.E. *ēo*, (2) to the great frequency of *ea* forms for O.E. *ēa*, and (3) to the frequent use of *ye*, *ya* and variant forms for O.E. *ēo* and *ēa* respectively, it has often been conjectured that in the dialect of this text at least, if not in Kentish as a whole, *ēa* and *ēo* became rising diphthongs, which eventually reached a stage represented phonetically by *je* (= *j* + tense *ē*) and *jɛ* (= *j* + slack *ē*). In addition to such evidence as can be gleaned from the documents themselves, such place-names as *Yalding* and *Yaldham* have been adduced to support this theory.

Digitized by Google Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

My aim in the following pages will be to demonstrate, from the evidence both of S.E. documents and of modern dialects, (1) that there is no strong evidence against the assumption of a development in Kentish of these diphthongs parallel to that of other dialects in general, and (2) that there are certain difficulties in the way of assuming either of the values—*je* (*jɛ*) or *ié* (*iɛ́*)—previously upheld by various scholars, as the normal result in Middle Kentish.

The two fullest accounts of this subject, with which I am familiar, are Konrath's (*Herrig's Archiv*, 88) and Heuser's (*Anglia*, 17) which was written as a direct answer to Konrath's. It will be helpful to glance briefly at their main points before examining the evidence of the documents themselves. Konrath, who brings forward no very satisfactory evidence on either side, was of the opinion that medially and finally the diphthongs had the same development in Kentish as in other dialects, but that initially they became rising diphthongs, and eventually *je*, *jɛ*. Heuser attempted to prove (1) the impossibility of different qualities existing for the same original diphthong in initial and medial positions and (2) that the orthography of the *Ayenbite* points clearly to the values *je* (*jɛ*) or *ié* (*iɛ́*) in both positions. Apart from the apparent discrepancy between the diphthongal and even triphthongal forms of *Ayenbite*—*ea*, *ia*, *iea*, *yea*, *ye*, *ie*—and the monophthongal sounds obtaining in other dialects, the main points on which he based his argument are:

(1) *ea* and shortened *ēa* could not, in Kentish, become *a* except by becoming first a rising diphthong, of which the first element was eventually lost;

(2) In the case of diphthongs followed by lengthening consonant-groups, it is more reasonable to suppose that the second element, being nearer to the lengthening influence, would be affected rather than the first;

(3) Since the forms *ie*, *ye* were used in *Ayenbite* almost exclusively to represent O.E. *ēo*, it would appear that in this dialect *ie* was used exclusively for the resultant sound of *ēo* and not as a general symbol for tense *ē*. He then conjectures that, since Old French *ie* as a rising diphthong remained until the middle of the twelfth century separated from *e* in Anglo-Norman poetry, *ie* in Kentish may have come to be used to represent *ēo*, while it was still a diphthong;

(4) As O.E. (W.S.) *ǣ* is represented almost invariably as *e* in *Ayenbite*, it is hardly feasible that diphthongal spellings would be used to represent a similar sound of different origin.

The first statement was based by Heuser on the fact that O.E. (W.S.)

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

æ and shortened *ǣ* became *e* in Kentish. But, even though W.S. *ea* and *æ* came to have the same sound in the M.E. period, this was not necessarily true for Kentish, which had *e* for W.S. *æ* and *ē* for W.S. *ǣ* as well as for *ā-i* (mutation of *ā*) during the O.E. period. Thus *ea* in Kentish, having an essentially different quality from the *e* (= W.S. *æ*), would have an essentially different development, and would normally become *a* following the same process as W.S. *ea*. There is no more necessity to assume a rising diphthong in Kentish than in any other dialect.

His second point, as a mere theory, is quite a logical supposition, but one that would apply equally well to all dialects. We have no reason to suppose that the lengthening consonant-groups exercised a different kind of influence in Kentish than in other dialects. Hence, we should have to assume that *ēa*, *ēo* before such groups became rising diphthongs in all dialects where fracture took place, which is not borne out by the evidence.

His third point is also fairly sound as a logical process, but is not consistent with the evidence yielded by other texts. It is true that in *Ayenbite*, *ie* is rarely used except for O.E. *ēo*, and the few exceptions—*cliene*, *yclienzed*, *zuyetnesse*, *hier*, *hyer*, the last two frequently—cannot be proved not to be scribal errors, which Heuser assumes them to be. This might very well point to a deliberate use of *ie* (*ye*) for *ēo* having become traditional, though not necessarily having a *je* sound. In many S.E. texts *ie* was used for O.E. *ēo*, while also being used to represent O.E. *ē*, but in the *Trinity College Homilies* (c. 1200), assigned by Prof. Wyld to the London area (*Essays and Studies*, Vol. VI, 136), *ie* is used frequently to represent *ēo*—*lief*, *bieþ*, *wiþtien*, *dieuel*, *diepe*, *þiefes*, *friende*, *fersien*—yet it is used on only two doubtful occasions to represent other O.E. sounds—*ʒie* (= *gē*), *ʒielefe* (= *gelēafa*). These two words are possibly scribal errors, but, isolated as they are, they cannot represent a traditional use of *ie*. Yet, although the case for a deliberate use of *ie* to represent O.E. *ēo* only is even stronger here than in *Ayenbite*, the still more frequent use of *e* for O.E. *ēo*—*ben*, *deflen*, *prest*, *forlese*, *lef*, *þeues*, *depe*—shows quite clearly that the sound was a monophthong of the *e* type. The almost exclusive use of *ie* for *ēo* in *Ayenbite* can therefore afford no definite evidence of any kind of diphthongal or *je* value.

In answer to Heuser's fourth point that widely different symbols—*e* and *ea* (*ya*, *ia*, etc.)—would not be used to represent the same sound in M. Kentish, even though of different origin in O.E., we can only adduce the general traditional use of *ea* in many dialects, after it had been monophthongised, and its frequent use to represent *even* O.E. (W.S.) *ǣ*.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Heuser admitted that the variant forms for O.E. *ēa* in *Ayenbite*—*ea, ia, ya, iea, yea*—must represent the same sound. The difference therefore merely amounts to the difference between *e* and any *one* of these. If so many authors could use two symbols *ie* and *e* (as they did in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, and as we do still) to represent the same sound, whether of different or even the *same* origin, why should it appear strange or impossible for the author of *Ayenbite* to use different symbols of another kind to represent sounds that had merged into one? Finally, Heuser is assuming that O.E. (W.S.) *ǣ* and *ēa* would become the same in M. Kent. But since both O.E. (W.S.) *ǣ* and *ā-i* became *tense e* sounds in Kentish, this sound would be quite distinct from the *slack* ɛ sound resulting from *ēa*. Hence there would be an advantage in using a different symbol.

After thus considering the main points urged previously in support of the theory of a rising diphthong or *je* type, we may now turn to the actual texts, the orthography of which must in all cases be the best basis for evidence.

That the distinctive spellings—*ye* for *ēo*, and *ya, yea, ia, iea* for *ēa*—are not confined strictly to Kentish, we have (apart from isolated forms such as *liache* (= lǣce) in the *Lambeth Homilies*, of the London area) at least one text in which these forms are more frequent even than in *Ayenbite*.

In the C Text of the *O.E. Prose Genesis* (of which a complete phonological account was kindly sent to me by the recent editor Mr S. J. Crawford), not only O.E. *eā* but even *eă* is represented in this distinctive way (see appendix), and the spelling of O.E. *eo* varies between *y* (*u*), and *yo, io*. There is, of course, no conclusive proof that it is not Kentish, but as far as Mr Crawford could judge from the phonology, its dialect is that of the area round Berks or Bucks. This text is chiefly interesting as showing these distinctive forms for the short diphthong *ea*—*forgiaf, gesieah, biarn, cyealf*—and as the date assigned to the text is about 1150, and as in the *Kentish Sermons* (of c. 1250), the short diphthongs are represented by monophthongs, Heuser's theory as based on orthography would lead us to suppose that the short (as well as the long) diphthongs actually reached the *je* stage, and that the first element was lost about the end of the twelfth century. As a matter of fact Heuser did not advance the theory that the short diphthongs (except such as were lengthened before consonant-groups) had such a development, so either we must extend the theory further or admit that the orthography indicates something entirely different.

For the sake of convenience, I append a brief account of the phonology

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

of each of the so-called Kentish texts, as well as of the *Prose Genesis*, in which sufficient examples may be found to support my future statements.

In the Kentish version of the *Poema Morale* (*P.M.*), the *Kentish Sermons* (*K.S.*), *William of Shoreham* (*Shor.*) and the *Ayenbite*, *eō*, *eā* are usually represented by diphthongal (or triphthongal) forms, and *eo*, *ea* by monophthongs. The two main points on which the theory of a *je* (*jɛ*) type has been based are (1) the late period (mid-fourteenth century) at which the distinctive forms are retained, and (2) the unusual nature of these forms. We must first, then, bring forward what evidence there is against the theory, and second, attempt to find a reason for the lateness and the unusual nature of such spellings.

It is a sound philological maxim that a fair number of altered spellings is a surer indication of *sound-change* than a large number of traditional spellings is of *sound-stability*. If we may then, for the moment, conceive of these various spellings for O.E. *ēa* as possibly traditional (to which we shall return later, p. 6), a fair number of monophthongal forms would offer strong evidence against the theory of a *je* type. Such are:

Early texts
- *P.M.*: *ea*: *deþ, ded.*
- *P.M.*: *ēo*: *defles, frende, vend.*
- *K.S.*: *ēa*: *belaue.*
- *K.S.*: *ēo*: *prest, frend, betuene.*

Late texts
- *Shor.*: *ēa*: *reue, brede, helde* (infin.), *deþe, onneþe, queed, dekene.*
- *Shor.*: *ēo*: *breste.*
- *Ayenbite*: *ēa*: *kued, heued, beleue* (noun), *sle* (infin.), *leues, stremes.*
- *Ayenbite*: *ēo*: *urendes, helden* (pret.), *leue* (adj.), *weuede, wefde, zuere, betuene.*

These lists, especially for the important text, *Ayenbite*, leave little room for doubt that a monophthongal pronunciation without *j* did exist. If we assume doublet forms for Kentish, we cannot conceive of one whereby in some words the diphthongs had one value, and in some words another, as practically all the words here listed have diphthongal spellings as well (see appendix). The difference between the two sounds (*e* and *je*) (*ɛ* and *jɛ*) is too great to assume doublet forms in a medial position for the same word. Even if we make this assumption, the later universal use of the *e* (*ɛ*) type would point to a preponderance of such in the fourteenth century. One sure piece of evidence against the

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

theory of a *je* (*jɛ*) type would be the occurrence of *ea* spellings for O.E. (W.S.) *ǣ*, just as the occurrence of *ie* for O.E. *ē* (see p. 3). Unfortunately the number of such forms in *Ayenbite*—*leawed*, *sleaþe*, and doubtfully *year*, *yeaue*—is too small to yield satisfactory evidence. Since, however, O.E. (W.S.) *ǣ* became tense *ē* in Kentish, we should not expect to find such forms. The confused orthography of *Shor.* renders the frequency of similar forms in that text of no value as evidence on this point.

In addition to the forms already mentioned (p. 5), there are some words in *Ayenbite*, in which *y* and *i* are written for O.E. *ēo*—*byþ*, *dyuel*, *chise* (infin.), *hild* (pret.), *uillen* (pret.), *urindes*. These forms, besides affording additional evidence against a *je* (*jɛ*) type, may indicate a tendency of *ē* to become *ī*, a change which is far from being satisfactorily dated (see Wyld, *Mod. Coll. Eng.* 209). [This spelling—*y*, *i*—is general for final *ēo*, *by* (= bēo), *beuli* (flēon), *uri* (frēo), although in many cases in this position, it can be accounted for by assuming analogy with mutated forms.] If this spelling did indicate such a tendency, the slack *ɛ* would probably have been undergoing a change to tense *e* at the same time, which would satisfactorily explain the occasional but rare instances in which O.E. *ēu* is represented by *ie*, *ye*—*lyesinges*, *tyeres*, *hyeldeþ*.

In one text, at least, *Genesis and Exodus*, there are a few words which appear, even more than the 'Kentish' ones, to indicate a *je* sound. Such are *tgeld* (= tealt), *tgen* (= ten), *feger*, *figer* (= far), *digere* (= dear). As, however, *tgeld* is also used for *teld* (= tent) and *figer* for *fȳr* (= fire) it is evident that the *ge* is not confined to O.E. *ēa*, *ēo*, but arose from some other cause. The scarcity of such forms allows no possibility of a *je* pronunciation by the writer of this poem, even though he regularly used *g* to represent O.E. front *g* and Gmc. *j*. In the words containing *r*, the spelling may indicate an attempt to show the development of a glide vowel before the *r*, and in the others or even in all, the *g* may have been used to represent length, as seems to have been the case sometimes in M.E. (cf. *Shor. foɜt* = *fōt*).

The chief difficulty lies in the initial sounds, on which Konrath and Heuser are in agreement. Such monophthongal forms as occur can almost invariably be explained by lack of fracture, and form, therefore, no evidence for monophthongisation. We find, however, in these 'Kentish' texts that *ye*, *ya* are written not only for long but also for short diphthongs—*yarn* (pret.), *yerþe*—and we find similar forms in other dialects—*ɜierles* (= eorlas, *Trin. Coll. Hom.*), *ɜeorre* (= eorre, *Lamb. Hom.*), *yerne* (run, *Vices and Vertues*), *getenes*, *getenisse* (eoten, *Genesis and Exodus*). Such

Digitized by Google

Original from
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

words show that the spelling was not confined to Kentish, nor restricted to the long diphthongs, and other words—as Godes *ȝeie* (= fear), *ælcere ȝiending* (ending), both in *Lamb. Hom.*—make it clear that the *y* spelling was not confined to words having an original diphthong. Prof. Wyld has suggested that, in the S.E. dialects generally, *ĕ* sounds probably had an on-glide which in some cases produced a *j* sound. Since also we must account in some way for the numerous words in the modern dialects which have an initial *j* sound quite distinct from O.E. diphthongs—*yend, yearly, yeat*—it is quite evident that this phenomenon was not owing to a change of accent in O.E. *ēo*, *ēa*. In answer to the objection that the orthography of the 'Kentish' texts must point clearly to a deliberate spelling of the initial diphthong to represent a *j* sound, we may ask why did the writers so often use *ea*, which was regularly used by many writers (as we have seen, occasionally even in *Ayenbite*), to represent a monophthong? The place-names *Yalding, Yaldham* may derive their present pronunciation from the spelling, as so frequently happened. Still, the orthography of these texts for the initial diphthongs, unlike the medial ones, yields strong evidence for a *j* pronunciation. It is extremely probable that the combination of circumstances, an on-glide and a diphthong, still further aided in breath-groups in which the diphthong was preceded by a word ending in a vowel, especially *þe*, would cause the development of a *je* pronunciation in many words, in which the diphthongs had also more normally become monophthongs of the *e* (*ɛ*) type. The prevalence of *y* spellings in words, which had a simple vowel for the initial sound in O.E., proves that such *j* pronunciation as did exist was not primarily due to a special 'Kentish' development of *ēa*, *ēo*.

If, however, *ēa*, *ēo* did not, as special dialectal peculiarities, and from causes rising from their own nature, become rising diphthongs yielding eventually *jɛ*, *je*, we must consider why diphthongal spellings were used so late as the fourteenth century, and why such unusual forms were employed. Do these forms—*ya*, *yea*, *ye*, etc.—represent a continuation of diphthongal value in fourteenth-century Kentish of the types *ɛ̯* (= *ēa*) and *e̯* (= *ēo*)? It is very unlikely that any trace of a diphthong was left in any dialect at so late a period. The frequent monophthongal forms already cited for *Ayenbite* (p. 5) are sufficient evidence against this assumption, as also the rhymes (in the same text) *bread* : *yzed*, *dyad* : *red*, *vend* (= fiend) : *mankende* : *ende*.

We have already (p. 5) admitted the possibility that the various spellings for *ēa* in *Ayenbite* and elsewhere may have been mere tradi-

Digitized by Google Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

tional spellings. (Since *ie* (*ye*) was used by many writers to express *ē*, i.e. a sound quite distinct from what *ie* would seem to represent, there is no need to discuss the possibility of its being used merely traditionally. It was so used by other writers, therefore possibly by the author of *Ayenbite*.) The fact that all the variant forms representing O.E. *ēa* are found already in the twelfth century (*Prose Genesis*) makes it possible to assume that such spellings in the fourteenth century may be merely archaic forms—traditional spellings for a sound which had existed in the twelfth century or earlier, but was by the fourteenth century entirely lost. If *ya*, *yea*, etc. represented, in the twelfth century, falling diphthongs, of which the second element was not completely lost, the long continuation of the traditional forms may point to greater conservatism in Kentish (and perhaps neighbouring dialects) than elsewhere, in that the diphthongs, both long and short, were preserved as such slightly longer in the extreme S.E. area than elsewhere, and perhaps longer in Kentish than in the other S.E. dialects. This agrees with the general practice, that the more southerly the dialect, the more conservative it is found to be both in sound-change and in orthography.

Since the apparent use of *ie* to represent definitely *ēo* (cf. *Trin. Coll. Hom.*) in other dialects seems to indicate that *ie* was used—by some writers at least, or even in some dialects as a whole—to represent the resultant value of *ēo* while it still retained diphthongal value, *ia* may have been invented to represent *ēa* at a similar stage. This would serve a double purpose, because (1) *ea*, which was becoming more and more used for O.E. (W.S.) *ǣ* by many M.E. writers, would not be sufficiently distinctive to a careful Kentish author, and (2) if O.E. *ēa*, like O.E. *ā-i*, was in Kentish and neighbouring dialects a more tense sound than elsewhere, *ia* (or *iea*) would represent this sound more accurately than *ea*. Then, just as *ea* elsewhere was for a long time used traditionally after all diphthongal value was lost, so in Kentish *ia* (*iea*) would be similarly used. Its retention in the fourteenth century would also be explained sufficiently by assuming a slightly longer retention of diphthongal value in Kentish than in dialects further north, and perhaps also, to a certain extent, by the desire of a careful writer to distinguish this *ɛ* sound (which even if it was more tense than the resultant value of *ēa* further north, would still be quite distinct from, and more slack than, the *e* from O.E. *ēo*) from the tense *e*. No dialect had any symbol whereby *ɛ* could be expressed differently from *e*, and we can never know how much this fact helped towards a more general use of *ie* for tense *e* in an attempt to differentiate

Digitized by Google

Original from
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

the two sounds. In the same way, there is no improbability in the assumption of *ia* being used for a similar differentiating purpose.

The variation *ia, ya* and *ie, ye* may have no special significance, or on the other hand, may point to an original distinction between short and long diphthongs.

With the exception of *cyealf* (*Prose Genesis*) and *lyerni* (in various texts, and possibly due to lengthening *preserved* before *rn*), I have found no examples of *ya*, or *ye*, to represent old *short* diphthongs which remained *short* in M.E. Thus, at a time before either long or short diphthongs had been monophthongised, some writers may have used the *y* combinations to distinguish graphically long and short diphthongs just as they used *y* often to represent *ī*. In the late thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, when the short diphthongs came to be expressed almost universally by simple vowels (*K.S.* and *Ayenbite*) there would no longer be any necessity to keep strictly to the *y* spellings for long diphthongs; hence the indiscriminate use of *ea, ya, ia* for *ēa* and *ie, ye* for *ēo*.

In conclusion, we must admit that the present state of our knowledge of M.E. dialects does not permit any decisive opinion on the value of these 'Kentish' forms. It has simply been my aim to show that, apart from the improbability of a small group of S.E. dialects, or Kentish alone, having had in these two diphthongs *ēa*, *ēo*, a strikingly different history from all the other dialects, there are still many difficulties to be encountered in the texts themselves against the theory of a *jɛ* (*je*) type of sound, while, at the same time, there are no objections, which cannot reasonably be explained away, against assuming that the history of these diphthongs was the same in Kentish as elsewhere.

Appendix.

In this appendix I propose to indicate, as briefly as possible, the ways in which the O.E. *ēa*, *ēo* are expressed in the five main texts used in the preceding pages. In all cases, the regular mode, i.e. diphthongal or triphthongal forms, will be illustrated merely by one or two examples. The exceptions, i.e. the monophthongal forms, upon which the discussion largely depends, will be as complete as possible wherever it is necessary.

I. *Prose Genesis*:

ēa > *ia, ya, iea, ie, ye*: *bebiad, sceamlyasan, dieadan, þriede, lyeuum.*
No monophthongal forms.

ĕa (except before recognised lengthening groups):
> *ia, iea, ie*: *forgiaf, biam, gesieah, wierþ.*
> *yea*: *cyealf* (no others).

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

ĕă > *æ, a* (representing lack of fracture before lengthening groups): *ældode, aldorman, falde, towærdra* (but *towierd*).
ēŏ > *yo, io*: *lyof, byo, bioþ.*
> *u, y*: *þustro, þystru, ælþudignesse, ful*, etc.
ĕŏ > *e, o, u*: *hefonas, orþan, furlenum.*

II. *Poema Morale*:
ēă > *ea, ia*: *ealdi, lean, deaþe, hialde*, etc.
> *e*: *deþ, ded.*
ēŏ > *ie*: *ibien, isien, þieue, lief*, etc.
> *eo*: *deoflen, feond*, etc.
> *e*: *defles, frende, vend.*
(Short diphthongs usually represented by monophthongs.)

III. *Kentish Sermons*:
ēă > *ia, ya, ea*: *ealde, yare, beleaue*, etc.
> *a*: *belaue.*
ēŏ > *ie*: *þrie, liese, bien, dieule.*
> *e*: *prest, frend, betuene.*
(Short diphthongs represented by monophthongs.)

IV. *Shoreham*:
ēă > *ea, ya*: *queade, breade, byaldeþ, lyas*, etc.
> *e*: *reue* (:reaue), *brede* (:breade), *helde* (:healdeþ), *deþe* (:diaþ), *onneþe* (:onneaþe), *queed* (:queade), *dekene* (:sudeakne).
ēŏ > *ie, eo*: *lief, iseoþ*, etc.
> *y*: *hylde* (pret.).
> *e*: *brest.*

V. *Ayenbite*:
ēă > *ea, ya, yea, iea, ia*: *tealde, stream, byad, tyares, tyeares*, etc.
> *ie* (*ye*): *lyesinges, tyeres, hyeldeþ.*
> *e*: *kued* (:kueade), *heued* (:heauedes), *byleue* (:byleaue, bylyaue), *sle* (:slea), *leues* (:leaues, lyeaues), *stremes* (:stream).

initial *ēă* > *yea, ya, ye*: *yealde, yeare, yere, yeast*, etc.
> *ea*: *ealding, eare.*
> *a*: *ald* (lack of fracture).
ēŏ > *ie, ye*: *bieþ, byeþ, dieuel, dyeuel*, etc.
> *y, i*: *byþ, dyuel, chise, hild* (pret.), *uillen* (pret).
> *e*: *urendes* (:uryendes), *uend* (:*uyende*), *helden* (pret.), *leue* (:lyeue), *weuede, wefde* (:wyefde), *zuere, betuene.*

A. B. Taylor.

Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

JOHN FORD, THE AUTHOR OF 'THE SPANISH GIPSY.'

ALTHOUGH, so far as I can find, no critic has heretofore questioned the ascription to Middleton and Rowley of *The Spanish Gipsy* I have long doubted whether Middleton had any hand in this play, finding it utterly dissimilar in style from his other dramatic work, whether assigned to him alone or to Middleton and Rowley. Recently a prolonged study of Middleton's plays converted my doubts into a feeling of absolute certainty that he was in no way concerned in *The Spanish Gipsy*, either as original author or reviser. At first I was inclined to suspect that Webster wrote the tragic and romantic parts usually assumed to be Middleton's. These are certainly more in Webster's manner than Middleton's, and I was the more disposed to suspect Webster because I had previously found palpable traces of his collaboration with Middleton in *Anything for a Quiet Life*, published under Middleton's name alone in 1654[1]. However, a closer examination of the text of *The Spanish Gipsy* convinced me that I was on the wrong track, its resemblances to Webster's acknowledged dramas being too slight and of too vague a kind to afford any sound basis for my suspicion. Accordingly, having other work on hand at the time, I put the play aside. I did not return to it until a few months ago, and then, aided by the notes made on my previous examination, almost immediately found the clues which led me (as I believe) to the discovery of the real author. It is, I am convinced, substantially, if not wholly, from the pen of John Ford. That the main part of the play is his I feel no doubt whatever, and as clear traces of his hand are also to be found in the Sancho and Soto and gipsy scenes (usually attributed to Rowley) I am strongly disposed to believe that Ford wrote the whole play. These scenes are, however, more pleasing than is usual with Ford, whose efforts at frivolity are seldom successful and usually disgusting. For this reason one must admit the possibility that these gipsy scenes have been revised or rewritten by some other dramatist. But, if this be the case, I see no reason for supposing that this dramatist was Rowley. I can find no satisfactory internal evidence for Rowley in any part of the play and if the external evidence can be shown to be false as regards Middleton, it is clearly equally worthless

[1] See *Notes and Queries*, 12 S. ix [1921], pp. 181, 202, 225, 300.

Digitized by Google

Original from
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

evidence for Rowley. The internal evidence is at least sufficient to show that *The Spanish Gipsy* is substantially Ford's play, that henceforth it should be included among his dramatic works and excluded from Middleton's.

Before I deal with this internal evidence, it is necessary that I should say a few words regarding the attribution to Middleton and Rowley. The play was first printed twenty-six years after Middleton's death, the title-page running as follows:

'THE SPANISH GIPSIE. As it was Acted (with great Applause) at the Privat House in Drury-Lane, and Salisbury Court. Written by Thomas Middleton and William Rowley, Gent. Never Printed before. London, Printed by J. G. for Richard Marriot in St Dunstan's Church-yard, Fleetstreet, 1653.'

Assuming Marriot to have been wrong in attributing *The Spanish Gipsy* to Middleton and Rowley, there would—apart from any reason to suspect his good faith—be no need to suppose that he knew the attribution to be incorrect. It is, of course, possible that he acted innocently. On the other hand it is not only possible, but probable, that he did not. That he was capable of assigning a play to a well-known dramatist knowing the attribution to be false is shown by his conduct with regard to a play published by him in the following year. In 1654 he published *Revenge for Honour* as 'A Tragedie by George Chapman.' Internal evidence shows that this was written not by George Chapman but by Henry Glapthorne[1]. And Marriot *knew* that it was Glapthorne's, having entered it as his in the Stationers' Register only the year before. In this case, then, we find Marriot entering a play in the Register under the name of its real author, a little-known playwright, and immediately afterwards publishing it as the work of another dramatist of established reputation. That is all that need be said about Marriot's attribution of the play to Middleton and Rowley.

The first feature of the text that brought Ford to my mind was the double-rhymed couplet at the end of I, iii—the scene immediately following the rape of Clara by Roderigo. As he leaves his victim, Roderigo exclaims:

> My shame may live without me,
> But in my soul I bear my guilt about me.

I could not recollect the use of such a couplet anywhere in Middleton's plays. And this particular kind of double rhyme is specially

[1] See *Notes and Queries*, 12 S. i [1916], pp. 401–404.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

characteristic of, if not peculiar to, Ford. In *Love's Sacrifice* (v, ii) he has:

> No counsel from our cruel wills can win us
> But, ills once done, we *bear our guilt within us*;

and in *The Broken Heart*, I, i, is a couplet even more closely resembling that in *The Spanish Gipsy*:

> Souls sunk in sorrow never are without them,
> They change fresh airs, but *bear their griefs about them.*

The next point I noted struck me as still more significant. About fifty lines further on—in Roderigo's fourth speech in I, v—we meet with the expression 'the float of those desires.' Speaking of Clara, Roderigo says to Lewis:

> I found, even in that beauty that invited me,
> Such a commanding majesty of chaste
> And humbly glorious virtue, that it did not
> More check my rash attempt, than *draw to ebb*
> *The float of those desires*, which in an instant
> Were cool'd in their own streams of shame and folly;

'float' here meaning 'flood,' as contrasted with 'ebb.' Nowhere else, outside Ford's dramatic works, have I found 'float' in this sense. Ford has it at least three or four times. 'The float of the unruly faction in my blood' is in *Love's Sacrifice* (I, ii), 'float of spleen' in *The Sun's Darling* (Act I), and, again in *Love's Sacrifice* (II, iii), we have 'the float of infinite desires.' Here, when Bianca rejects his advances, Fernando exclaims:

> ....though *the float*
> *Of infinite desires swell to a tide*
> *Too high so soon to ebb*, yet, by this hand,
> .....
> I swear henceforth I never will...presume
> To make a repetition of my griefs.

The occurrence in this speech of Roderigo's of one of the most distinctive words in Ford's vocabulary is not its only suggestion of his hand. Ford, like most dramatists of the time, occasionally echoes himself, and in *The Lady's Trial* he echoes this very speech. In IV, ii Adurni tells his friend Auria that when he attempted to undermine the virtue of Spinella, Auria's wife,

> ...so much majesty
> Of humbleness and scorn appear'd at once
> In fair, in chaste, in wise Spinella's eyes
> That I grew dull in utterance, and one frown
> From her cool'd every flame of sensual appetite.

These two features, then—the double-rhymed couplets (there is another at the end of I, v) and the use of the word 'float'—were what caused me to suspect that *The Spanish Gipsy* was written by Ford, and led me

Digitized by Google Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

to compare it with his unquestioned work. The results of this comparison I shall now give.

To take the vocabulary first, the play contains, as we have seen, one very uncommon word used by Ford—the only really rare word to be found in it. It contains also almost all the more characteristic words of Ford's vocabulary. Many of these are quite common words which nevertheless gradually obtrude themselves on the notice of a reader in the course of repeated perusals of Ford's plays owing to the unusual frequency with which he uses them. *Antic*, *bosom*, *chronicle*, *crave*, *creature*, *dally*, *fate*, *forfeit* (as noun), *mad* (as verb), *partake-r*, *penance*, and *thrive*, all of them favourite words of Ford's, are all found in *The Spanish Gipsy*. Three or four may be selected for special notice.

Bosom. A common word enough. But it is one which Ford uses with extraordinary frequency. He has it (on an average) about six times in a play. In *The Spanish Gipsy* it occurs five times.

Creature. A favourite expression of Ford's, as applied to a woman. It is here used eight times, e.g. 'a young creature' (I, i), 'that fair creature' (I, v), 'a handsome creature' (III, ii), 'a sweet creature' (IV, iii), 'lost creature' (V, i), 'talking creature' (V, iii). I have noted 'young creature' in *The Fancies, Chaste and Noble* (II, ii), 'sweet creature' in *'Tis Pity She's a Whore* (IV, i), 'lost creature' in *Perkin Warbeck* (IV, iii).

Forfeit (n.). Ford usually has this two or three times in a play. It occurs three times in *The Spanish Gipsy*:

> ....on the forfeit
> Of thine own life or mine, seal up thy lips. I, ii.
> How are so many harmless virgins wrought
> .....to yield
> Too easy forfeits of their shames and liberty. I, iii.
> The forfeit of her shame shall be her pawn. V, i.

We may compare:

> Wishing the laws of England could remit
> The forfeit of your life. *Perkin Warbeck*, II, ii.
> My wretched wife....hath paid too soon
> The forfeit of her modesty and life. *'Tis Pity*, IV, ii.
> Penthea's, poor Penthea's, name is strumpeted,
> But since her blood was season'd by the forfeit
> Of noble shame..... *The Broken Heart*, IV, ii.

Partake, partaker. There is scarcely a play of Ford's in which one or other of these words is not used at least once. Both are in *The Spanish Gipsy*:

> My honourable lord, *partake* my blessings. V, iii.
> No friend but thee alone...shall be *partaker* of my griefs. I, v.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

There is one favourite word of Ford's not used in *The Spanish Gipsy*—the word *bounty* (or *bounties*, in the plural). I mention this as showing that one cannot rely upon this vocabulary test (the testing of the vocabulary of a suspected work for the presence of an author's pet words) to yield satisfactory results in every instance. As Ford has *bounty* on an average six or seven times in a play, I naturally expected to find it here. But on reference to my notes I found that in one of his plays (*'Tis Pity*) the word occurs only once, so that its absence from *The Spanish Gipsy* need cause no surprise.

A habit particularly characteristic of Ford is the use of the abbreviated forms 'd'ee' and 't'ee' for 'do you' and 'to you.' Until I came to study *The Spanish Gipsy*, using an edition reproducing the spelling of the early quartos, I was under the impression that 'd'ye' and 't'ye' were the forms habitual with Ford. But these are the modern substitutes for Ford's 'd'ee' and 't'ee' adopted (in my opinion unwarrantably) by his nineteenth-century editors, as I discovered on referring to the original editions of his plays in the British Museum. In *The Spanish Gipsy* we find 'My lord, d'ee know this crucifix?' (III, ii), 'Why d'ee mock my sorrows?' (V, i), 'I come for justice t'ee' (V, i), 'What d'ee mean,' 'But why d'ee use me thus?' and 'I may be bold To make a suit t'ee' (V, iii). This of itself is almost sufficient to prove Ford's presence, for no other dramatist of the time habitually adopts these abbreviations. Certainly Middleton does not. They will be found in Ford *passim*. To take a play at random, 'When d'ee intend to visit my noble-spirited sister,' 'Las, why d'ee use me thus' (the same phrase as in *The Spanish Gipsy*), 'Take your jewel t'ee,' 'Good time of day t'ee' are to be found in *The Lover's Melancholy*, and it may be added that three times Ford uses the phrase 'I have a suit t'ee' (*Love's Sacrifice*, I, ii, *The Fancies*, III, iii, *The Witch of Edmonton*, I, i). A most valuable piece of evidence this, which, through using modern editions of Ford's plays, I came near to missing.

I now take the play scene by scene in order that the reader may see how clear and how abundant are the traces of Ford's hand in its imagery and phrasing.

Act I.

Scenes i and ii. There is not much to suggest Ford in the two very brief scenes with which the play opens. But, at the end of the first scene, 'traitors to all goodness':

> I will raise Madrill to find
> These traitors to all goodness,

Digitized by Google Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

is likely to be his ('traitor to honour and shame' is in *The Lover's Melancholy*, I, iii, 'traitor to friendship' in *Love's Sacrifice*, I, ii) and, in the second (third speech of Lewis), we have Ford's favourite word 'forfeit':

> .....on the forfeit
> Of thine own life or mine, seal up thy lips.

Scene iii. The marks of Ford are here unmistakable. Clara's opening speech:

> Though the black veil of night hath overclouded
> The world in darkness, yet, ere many hours,
> The sun will rise again, and then this act
> Of my dishonour will appear before you
> More black than is the canopy that shrouds it,

plainly speaks of the hand that wrote Livio's speech in V, i of *The Fancies*:

> .....she was once an innocent,
> As free from spot as the blue face of heaven
> Without a cloud in't; she is now as sullied
> As is that canopy when mists and vapours
> Divide it from our sight.

'Forfeits of their shames and liberty' is in Clara's fourth speech, and Roderigo's exclamation 'Phew!' at the end of the speech is a common interjection with Ford, but comparatively rare in the plays of other writers of the time. Next, in Clara's second speech after 'Re-enter Roderigo,' we have 'to write an epitaph' used metaphorically:

> ...if you mean to write upon my grave
> An epitaph of peace, forbear to question,

as in *The Lady's Trial*, I, i:

> A woman's virtue in her lifetime writes
> The epitaph all covet on their tombs.

A few lines later on in this speech:

> ...for my part
> I have *wash'd off the leprosy* that cleaves
> To my just shame *in true and honest tears*,

we have a passage that recalls the language of the Friar's exhortation to Giovanni in the first scene of *'Tis Pity*:

> *Wash every word thou utter'st*
> *In tears* (and if't be possible) of blood.
> Beg Heaven to *cleanse the leprosy* of lust
> That rots thy soul.

The scene ends with the double-rhymed couplet already referred to:

> My shame may live without me
> But in my soul I bear my guilt about me.

Scene iv. This is another very short scene; but, short as it is, there

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

need be no doubt that it is Ford's. Compare these lines from Don John's speech at the end of the scene,

> She is not noble, true. Wise nature meant
> Affection should ennoble her descent,

with these words of Giovanni in *'Tis Pity*, I, i:

> .....to which intent
> Wise nature first in your creation meant
> To make you mine.

The early quartos read 'enable' for 'ennoble' in the passage quoted from *The Spanish Gipsy*, and Professor E. C. Morris, in his edition of the play for the 'Belles Lettres' series, retains and defends this reading. But it is plain from the context that 'ennoble' is the right word. Ford uses this ('sweetness of disposition ennobles a freedom of birth') in his dedication of *'Tis Pity* to the Earl of Peterborough.

Scene v. I have already quoted the passage in Roderigo's speech beginning:

> I found, even in that beauty that invited me,
> Such a commanding majesty of chaste
> And humbly glorious virtue, &c.

with its parallel in *The Lady's Trial* and its use of the phrase 'the float of those desires,' so clearly pointing to Ford. Some twenty lines further on, when he says to Lewis:

> .....here I unclasp
> The secrets of my heart,

his language again reminds one of Giovanni's during his talk with the Friar in the opening scene of *'Tis Pity*:

> To you I have unclasped my burdened soul,
> Emptied the storehouse of my thoughts and heart,
> Made myself poor of secrets,

and, immediately after this, his commendation of Clara as 'a creature that deserves a temple' is also characteristic of Ford, whose heroines are frequently spoken of by their worshippers as 'temples' or 'shrines.' Roderigo next informs his friend that, to avoid temptation, he has determined to leave Madrid for Salamanca:

> Speed me
> For Salamanca, court my studies now
> For physic 'gainst *infection of the mind*;

and here we may compare the reply of Crotolon to Orgilus in *The Broken Heart*, III, iv, when Orgilus explains that he has hurried back from Athens on account of the 'general infection' prevailing in that city:

> I fear
> Thou hast brought back a worse infection with thee,
> *Infection of thy mind.*

Digitized by Google Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

In his next speech Roderigo impresses upon Lewis that the cause of his departure is to be kept secret from everyone but himself, adding:

> No friend but thou alone, for whose sake only
> I undertake this voluntary exile,
> Shall be partaker of my griefs.

The second line is repeated in *The Broken Heart*, I, i, where Orgilus (who is leaving Sparta for Athens) exclaims to his father, Crotolon:

> Hence, from hence,
> I undertake a voluntary exile.

His motive for undertaking this voluntary exile is, it may be noted, similar to Roderigo's—the desire to escape from the dangerous proximity of that 'shrine of beauty,' the fair Penthea. Ford repeats the phrase again in *The Lover's Melancholy*, I, iii, where Amethus tells his sister Thamasta that Menaphon has long and truly loved her, and that, 'to witness his obedience to her scorn':

> Twelve months, wrong'd gentleman, he undertook
> A voluntary exile.

This scene also ends with a double-rhymed couplet in Ford's manner:

> Pleasure and youth like smiling evils woo us
> To taste new follies; tasted, they undo us.

Act II.

Scene i. This, the first of the gipsy scenes, is almost wholly in prose. Unless a writer has some marked peculiarity of style, or tendency to repeat himself (which Ford has not), it is always much more difficult to assign prose passages than verse. But 'pastime'—a word he frequently uses—and the adjective 'roguy' (though not peculiar to him) slightly suggest Ford, and there is a stronger suggestion in the remark made by Soto when he sees Constanza, disguised as a gipsy,

> Is this the little ape does the fine tricks?

since Spadone, in *The Fancies*, IV, i, speaks in like fashion of his master's page Nitido, as he urges the barber Secco to thrash him:

> Lash him soundly; *let the little ape show his tricks.*

A more peculiar expression used by Spadone occurs a little later in this scene. Soto says to Eugenia:

> Grave Mother Bumby, *the mark's out a your mouth.*

In *The Fancies*, II, i, Secco asks Spadone if the letter that Spadone has brought for him is from 'the glory of beauty, Morosa, the fairest fair' and Spadone comments, aside:

> Fairest fair, quotha! so is an old rotten coddled mongrel, parcel bawd, parcel midwife; *all the marks are quite out of her mouth.*

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Scene ii. All the verse part of this scene has the ring of Ford's verse. In particular, we may compare Lewis's protestation to Clara:

> If ever I embrace another choice,
> Until I know you elsewhere match'd, may all
> The chief of my desires find scorn and ruin!

with a passage in the first scene (Ford's) of *The Witch of Edmonton* (Frank to Winnifred):

> .....Whenever
> The wanton heat of youth, by subtle baits
> Of beauty, or what woman's art can practise,
> Draw me from only loving thee, let Heaven
> Inflict upon my life some fearful ruin!

In the prose at the end (after 'Enter Sancho and Soto,' about one-third of the scene) I find no definite suggestion of Ford's hand.

Act III.

Scene i. This also is mostly prose, presenting no tangible evidence of Ford's hand. But when (in the short passage of verse at the beginning) we find Roderigo referring to Clara as a 'temple' that he has 'profaned':

> .....should this temple,
> By me profaned, lie in the ruins here,
> The pieces would scarce shew her me,

we may be fairly confident that his speech is Ford's. It is in the same fashion that Fernando speaks of Bianca in *Love's Sacrifice*, II, i:

> Heaven forbid that I
> Should by a wanton appetite profane
> This sacred temple;

and Bassanes of Penthea in *The Broken Heart*, IV, ii:

> I, who was made a monarch
> Of what a heart could wish for, a chaste wife,
> Endeavour'd, what in me lay, to pull down
> That temple built for adoration only
> And level 't in the dust of causeless scandal.

Scene ii. A long scene, largely occupied with gipsy dialogue and songs. There are a few words and phrases that point to Ford. In the two first lines:

> Lewis de Castro, since you circled are
> In such a golden ring of worthy friends,

we have some reason for inferring his authorship, for 'circled with friends' appears again in *The Lover's Melancholy*, V, i:

> Thus princes should be circled, with a guard
> Of truly noble friends;

and there is a stronger hint of it in the dialogue between Alvarez and

Digitized by Google Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Lewis later in the scene, where the former is professing to tell the latter's fortune from an examination of his hand:

Alvarez. That great ship was De Castro called, your father.
Lewis. And I must hew the rock that split him,

since in *The Broken Heart*, IV, i, we find Orgilus using the same metaphor and applying it in the same way:

Thou barren rock,
By thee we have been split in ken of harbour.

Here Orgilus himself is the ship and Bassanes the rock that has split him.

Scene iii. Ford's imagery and phrasing are clearly apparent in this scene. Note Clara's 'd'ee know this crucifix?' and (in Fernando's speech immediately after his re-entry):

What's beauty but a *perfect white and red*
Both here well mixt *limn* truth,

with which we may compare:

He who.....will merely wed
A face because 'tis round, or *limn'd* by nature
In *purest red and white*..... (*The Lover's Melancholy*, III, ii.)

Act IV.

Scene i. Though there is little to connect Ford with this scene (again concerned chiefly with the gipsies) I see no reason why it should not be his. It contains several songs, of which one (Sancho's first song) is much after the style of Folly's songs (which I believe to be Ford's) in Act I of *The Sun's Darling*. One cannot, of course, attach much weight to this. But, in the later portion, the allusion by Don John to Cardochia's 'better stars':

'Las, pretty soul,
Better stars guide you!

points more clearly to Ford. The same expression occurs in one of Euphranea's speeches in Act I, Scene iii of *The Broken Heart*:

.....it had been
A fault of judgment in me.....not to.....thank
My better stars that offered me the grace
Of so much blissfulness.

Scene ii. A short scene, in which the gipsies again appear. I note only one slight indication of Ford. In the Sancho and Soto part the allusion to ciphers making up numbers:

Fernando. What's your number?
San. The figure of nine casts us all up, my lord.
Fer. Nine, let me see—you are ten, sure.
Soto. That's our poet, he stands for a cipher.
Fer. Ciphers make numbers,

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

occurs again in *'Tis Pity*, I, ii:

.....look, sweetheart, look what thing comes now! Here's another of your ciphers to fill up the number.

Scene iii. This is the scene containing the play performed by the gipsies, and as, on the assumption that our play is by Middleton and Rowley, this inset play has been assigned to Rowley, it is of particular interest to note that there are passages in the dialogue strongly pointing to Ford. For instance, when Soto says to Alvarez:

Hold his nose to the grindstone, my lord,

he uses an expression that also occurs in the dialogue between Poggio and Bergetto in III, i of *'Tis Pity*[1]:

Hold him to the grindstone, and give not a jot of ground.

When Sancho speaks of 'slicing' Soto 'into collops' he talks as Bassanes does to Grausis in *The Broken Heart*, II, i:

I'll spit thee on a stake
Or chop thee into collops;

and when he exclaims:

We'll fight dog, fight bear,

he talks like Spadone in *The Fancies* (IV, i) as he watches the fight between Morosa and Secco:

Well played dog; well played bear.

Act V.

Scene i. In the interview between Fernando and his son Roderigo with which this opens we find in Fernando's utterances the same impressive solemnity of tone as in the Friar's admonishments of Giovanni in *'Tis Pity*. These speeches of Fernando have the full flavour of Ford. Nothing more typical of him could be quoted than this:

Peace! thou wilt blaze a sin beyond all precedent:
Young man, thou should'st have married her; the devil
Of lust that riots in thy eye should there
Have let fall love and pity, not on this stranger
Whom thou hast doted on.

This is exactly in the vein of the Friar's speech at the beginning of II, v of *'Tis Pity*:

Peace! thou hast told a tale, whose every word
Threatens eternal slaughter to the soul, &c.

Moreover in 'the devil of lust that riots in thy eye' we have an image characteristic of Ford, who has analogous expressions in *Perkin Warbeck*, v, iii ('the devil that ranges in your tongue'), and in *The*

[1] I have since found that it is also used by Middleton—in *Blurt, Master-Constable*, III, iii.

Digitized by Google Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Witch of Edmonton, I, i ('the nimble devil that wantoned in your blood'). The marks of his hand are abundant throughout the scene, amongst them Pretiosa's peculiar exclamation 'deed, la!'—

> I am honest,
> Deed, la! I am,

which recurs in *The Fancies*, II, ii:

> No, no, deed, la!
> A very grave, stale bachelor;

and Lewis's allusion to his 'better genius':

> Oh fate! Now tell me where,
> And be my *better genius*,

also found in *Perkin Warbeck*, III, iv, where the Earl of Crawford's remark that the king is 'deep in his meditations' brings from Dalyell the pious ejaculation:

> Lift them up
> To Heaven, his *better genius*!

No Ford play would be complete without a fatalistic utterance of some kind, and this we get in the concluding couplet:

> The miserable and the fortunate
> Are alike in this, they cannot change their fate.

Scene ii. This short scene also plainly bears Ford's impress. When Alvarez says to Lewis:

> Tremble not, young man, trust me, I have wept
> Religiously to wash off from my conscience
> The stain of my offence,

we again seem to hear the voice of the Friar in *'Tis Pity*. And the idea of guilt as a stain (or 'leprosy') to be 'washed off' with tears, already noted in that play and in I, iii of the present play, appears again in *Love's Sacrifice*, V, i:

> such a guilt
> As, were the sluices of thine eyes let up,
> Tears cannot wash it off.

Scene iii. In this final scene I have already drawn attention to the 'd'ee' and 't'ee' abbreviations as characteristic of Ford. There is little else to which I can point. But I note the hour-glass metaphor:

> The glass of misery
> Is, after many a change of desperate fortune,
> At length run out,

because, though not peculiar to Ford, it reappears in a passage of *The Witch of Edmonton* (V, i) clearly attributable to him:

> .....the glass of thy sins is full, and it must run out at gallows;

in the last act of *The Sun's Darling*, which is also his:

> Thy sands are number'd, and thy glass of frailty
> Here runs out to the last;

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

and in *The Broken Heart*, III, v:

> My glass of life, sweet princess, hath few minutes
> Remaining to run down; the sands are spent.

As Professor E. C. Morris says in his edition of the play to which I have already referred, 'The attitude of most critics towards the composition of *The Spanish Gipsy* has been one of caution'—an attitude, one may add, amply justified, since they were confronted with the task of dividing between two authors a play wrongly assigned to them. Some have professed to find Rowley's hand in the second act, others would allot to him the gipsy scenes. Fleay, who was not easily baffled by such problems, has not attempted a division, merely expressing his belief that the whole play was written by Middleton and afterwards 'touched up' by Rowley. Professor Morris is alone in a courageous attempt to split the text up between the two authors by scene and line. Yet after an elaborate discussion and comparison of the style and versification of the two authors, he has been unable to arrive at any more satisfactory conclusion than that certain parts of the play (about two-thirds of the text) are 'by Middleton with here and there a slight touch of Rowley' and the rest 'revised by Rowley, though showing here and there the original lines of Middleton.' His division is based merely on general impressions and one looks in vain for specific evidence of either author's hand. His and Fleay's failure to arrive at any definite assignment of the shares of the two supposititious authors tends to confirm my own opinion that it is from one hand. As I have shown above, traces of Ford's style and phrasing are to be found in every scene, and not only in the 'tragic or the romantic part of the play,' which according to the rash assertion of Swinburne 'bears the stamp of Middleton's genius alike in the sentiment and the style,' but in the less 'high-toned' passages that he would assign to Rowley. It is the stamp of Ford's genius that is apparent in the sentiment and style of the serious scenes of *The Spanish Gipsy*, a genius so unlike Middleton's that no thought of the latter's authorship could have entered the head of any critic had not Middleton's name appeared on the title-page. That Ford's style is less clearly traceable in the prose comedy scenes is true, but it would be equally difficult to find internal evidence to establish his authorship of the prose parts of his signed plays.

That the text of *The Spanish Gipsy* may have undergone some revision during the course of the thirty years that elapsed between the first recorded performance of the play (by the Cockpit company in 1623) and its publication, is of course not at all unlikely; all that I claim to

Digitized by Google Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

have proved is that Ford wrote the play and that his hand can be traced in every scene. A new edition of his collected works is long overdue, none having been issued since Dyce's edition of 1869. When it does appear, it is to be hoped that it will include both *The Spanish Gipsy* and *The Queen, or the Excellency of her Sex*, printed (though by a more honest publisher) in the same year, and reclaimed for Ford by Professor Bang of Louvain in 1906.

H. DUGDALE SYKES.

ENFIELD, MIDDLESEX.

Digitized by Google

Original from
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

WAS PETER CUNNINGHAM A FORGER?

A STORY is told of a raw Irish emigrant who on landing in New York found himself in the midst of a soul-stirring street fray and startled a curiously impassive policeman with the inquiry, 'Hey, constable, is this a strictly private fight or can anybody join in?' Much the same itching and the same puzzlement must have been experienced by a select group of scholars in December 1920, while witnessing the adroit exposition of the science of carte and tierce given by Mrs C. C. Stopes and Mr Ernest Law in their sustained encounter over the authenticity of the three long-impugned seventeenth-century Revels documents in the columns of *The Times Literary Supplement*. Possibly the end might have been a general mêlée, had not pause been given to the onlookers by the knowledge that these passages-at-arms were simply the renewal of an ancient bitter feud. Now, however, we who stood by a-quiver with excitement need no longer remain passive: Donnybrook Fair has been declared open. Nothing if not dauntless, Mrs Stopes has as good as challenged all comers in a pamphlet issued by the Shakespeare Association in which she recapitulates with eleventh-hour reinforcements all her reasons for doubting the documents. She believes the need for this further arraignment is great since 'many writers,' with myself at the head and front of the secondary offending, are still foolish enough to rally to the cause of Cunningham. Little as I have written to justify the place of honour given me, I am not churlish enough to evade the challenge. As it happens, there is much new evidence waiting to be advanced in the defence, evidence which will be found on examination not only to serve its immediate purpose but to add materially to the sum-total of our general knowledge.

First, observe the delicious irony of the whole situation. The gravamen of Mrs Stopes's charge against the three documents, their inconsistency with other official evidence, is of so magnificent a plausibility that it is bound to convince any student who has not taken the precaution to go over the ground for himself with minute particularity. Yet the humour of it is that it is this much blazoned discrepancy between the Revels Accounts of 1604–5 and 1611–12 and the correlative warrants issued by the Treasurer of the Chamber which largely assures me that the alleged Cunningham forgeries are wholly genuine. It is amazing to find a researcher of Mrs Stopes's experience expressing the belief that

Digitized by Google

Original from
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

because the court scribes of the period were well-paid their work was necessarily well done, that discrepancies between inter-related records could not be, and that the existence of any such discrepancies points to later falsification. The plain truth of the matter is that the old Revels Clerks had a prime capacity for blundering. I should not be disposed to hang a dog on their uncorroborated testimony. Proof of their manifold shortcomings is ready to hand. In Professor C. W. Wallace's *The Evolution of the English Drama up to Shakespeare* are to be found laboriously-compiled and meticulously-documented tables giving (1) a chronological list of plays and masques performed at court before Queen Elizabeth from 1558 to 1585, together with (2) a corresponding series of extracts from warrants for payments to players within that period. Luckily for poor Peter Cunningham's reputation, Mr Wallace has gone to the trouble of carefully noting all the serious disagreements between the Audit Office accounts and the Treasurer of the Chambers' records. Here are the references: p. 215, note 2 (1574); p. 216, note 1 (1575); p. 218, note 2 (1577); p. 220, note 2 (1579); p. 221, note 1 (1579); p. 223, note 1 (1581). Six blunders within seven years is a fairly good record: Handy Andy could have done little better. One begins to suspect that 'twice' is, in good sooth, 'a habit.' There is, moreover, another significant parallel. Mrs Stopes, by way of clinching her argument, points triumphantly to sundry clear omissions in the indicted Revels Accounts, unmindful of the fact that Professor Wallace (p. 198) speaks of having found exterior evidence for many court performances untraceable in either the Revels Books or Treasurer's entries.

According to the old Oxford dichotomy men are to be placed in two categories, fools and d——d fools. If Mrs Stopes is to be believed, Peter Cunningham ranked among the latter. Never was there poisoner of the wells who so readily provided antidote for the bane. Though he must have known that they were more or less contradictory to the two Revels Accounts, he published the corresponding Treasurer's warrants in his introduction (p. xxxvii). A forger would surely have taken care that all the dates were in harmony, that there should be sound equivalence. But, then, of course, Cunningham's stupidity must have been amazing. Judging by the individual orthography of Mrs Stopes's reproductions of the three documents, he was thoroughly incapable of deciphering his own forgeries!

It is equally astonishing to find that he concocted better than he knew. There are certain facts presented in the impugned documents which can be scientifically demonstrated now but could not have been

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

so demonstrated in 1842 when the *Revels Accounts* were published. Some of these will be discussed later, but meanwhile it may be pointed out that Cunningham's knowledge, so far from being ahead of, was not abreast with his times. He identifies (p. xl) *The Prowde Mayde*, a Lady Elizabeth's Men's play of 1612, with *The Maid's Tragedy*, though he should have known that the latter was published as a Blackfriars play and therefore belonged to the King's Men. Yet, despite this lack of scholarship on his part, it is remarkable that no investigator has since been able to show that a single one of the plays in the two impugned Revels Books is ante-dated. Very surprising this, considering that the books are said to have been forged to establish the dates of two or three of Shakespeare's plays.

So much for the problem in its broader aspects. I proceed now to some particular consideration of the three documents and of the arguments levelled against their authenticity by Mrs Stopes.

(I.) The Revells Booke. Anno 1605.

Assuming forgery, it is difficult to see what Cunningham sought to establish by assigning a performance of *The Moor of Venis* to Hallowmas Day, 1604. He points out, in a note on p. 224, that Collier had already discovered an earlier record of the play's existence in the Bridgewater MSS., a record we know now to have been forged. Literary forgers are essentially solitary workers, and we have no grounds for suspecting confederation. Moreover, the question has to be asked, Why did Cunningham write *The Moor of Venis* instead of *Othello*? How many Shakespearean scholars to-day are aware that, the titling of Q i and of the Folio play notwithstanding, the tragedy was commonly known and regularly acted throughout the first half of the seventeenth century as *The Moor of Venice*? ('Venice' titles seem to have had a peculiar fascination for the Elizabethan-Stuart playgoer.) Yet Cunningham's knowledge and resources were decidedly inferior to ours.

It chances that some support can be given to the Revels account in its dating of the tragedy. There are reasons for believing that Fletcher's *The Woman Hater*, printed in 1607 on the dissolution of the Paul's Boys, had been produced two years earlier. Professor Thorndike points out that the allusion in the prologue to the dangers of satire, taken in conjunction with the girdings in the play at intelligencers, can only have reference to the trouble over *Eastward Hoe*, and the clues place production not later than 1605. To my mind, this is vital, seeing that in his second and third acts Fletcher parodies passages in *All's Well*

Digitized by Google Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

that Ends Well, *Hamlet* and *Othello*. Lazarillo, on finding that he has again lost the fish-head, indulges in a long 'farewell' speech which would be senseless were it not in mockery of the Moor (he alone resorts to parody in the play):

> Farewell, you lusty archers of the guard
> To whom I now do give the bucklers up
> And never more with any of your coat
> Will eat for wagers!

There is much more in this vein, and the parody justifies the belief that, if *The Woman Hater* dates from 1605, the autumn of 1604 is not too early for the production of *Othello*.

One important fact in connexion with court payments to players seems equally unknown to Mrs Stopes and to scholars generally. The Treasurer of the Chamber was not wholly dependent upon the Revels Clerk for his knowledge. Whether or not the practice had been rendered necessary by the Revels Clerk's blundering, it was customary for the players to whom money was due to send in to the Lord Chamberlain a list of court performances remaining unpaid for. This was a salutary jogging of the official memory, seeing that accounts often remained for months unsettled. (In Charles II's time it was a question of years.) A number of these seventeenth-century players' lists are extant but only two of them belong to the Pre-Restoration period. Of these, one, curiously enough—it has never been clearly recognized for what it is—forms the third and last of the challenged Cunningham documents. That Mrs Stopes entertains no suspicion of any such furnishing of accounts being practised is shown by the circumstance that every time she finds the two Revels Books giving a wrong date for a play or omitting a traceable performance she scents forgery and asks triumphantly, Whence could the Treasurer have derived his information? The answer now is, From the players' lists.

While we who are defending Cunningham feel assured enough of our client's innocence to avoid wasting time by resort to any such expedient as abuse of counsel for the prosecution, still it is legitimate to complain that Mrs Stopes occasionally confuses the issue by inaccuracy or carelessness of statement. On p. 12 of her pamphlet, a Rosseter (presumably Philip Rosseter, the lutenist) is spoken of as in prominent associative control of the Blackfriars Boys early in 1605. There is surely some bungle here. One searches theatrical records in vain for any clue to the truth of this assertion.

On the very next page we find Mrs Stopes incautiously basing a line of argument on a quagmire, with the result that she is soon engaged in

Digitized by Google

Original from
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

a desperate struggle to extricate herself from the sinking soil. Starting with the assumption that the groups now of four and now of six men who figure in the Revels Accounts as having been paid for work and attendance in connexion with the performances were 'men who helped the performers,' she immediately finds herself called upon to explain the awkward circumstance that for one particular performance no such attendants were provided. A closer study of Cunningham's *Revels Accounts* will show that, so far from being pressed into service as supers and property-men (offices calling for people of experience), these groups of men were engaged for what an actor would call front-of-the-house duties, viz., to hang the temporary chandeliers on over-head wires, see to the fresh strewing of the hall with rushes and attend during the performance to the snuffing and replenishing of the candles. The players had no use for unrehearsed assistants and brought with them all the people they required, even to the very fiddlers. An entry in Sir Henry Herbert's Office Book[1] shows that the regular musicians, stage-keepers and other attendants on the King's Players, numbering in all 21, went with them to court in the Christmas of 1624.

(II.) The Revels Booke, 1611–12.

It is difficult to see how an historico-dramatic forger of eighty years ago, even a scholar of the highest accomplishments, a Collier, could have obtained the data for some of the information imparted by this list, especially regarding the obscurer plays. That of itself would not substantiate the document, but the details presented by one item (No. xi) certainly do. Here, as elsewhere, it is only by dint of recently acquired data that the scholar is able to put the record to the proof and bear testimony to its accuracy.

Take, for example, items vi and x dealing respectively with the two lost plays, Richard Niccols' *The Twins* and Cyril Tourneur's *The Nobleman*, both, it is to be observed, entered on the Stationers' books on the same day, February 15, 1611–12. While the period of registration might have afforded a forger a ready hint, he would still have been at a loss to determine by what players the two pieces were performed. Yet both were accurately assigned to the King's Men. Assuming the forger's acquaintance with it, the missing details could have been derived from the document now to be identified as Rawlinson MS., A. 239, leaf 47 (in the Bodleian), otherwise Lord Treasurer Stanhope's list of plays given at court by the King's Men in 1612–13, the season

[1] J. Q. Adams, *The Dramatic Records of Sir Henry Herbert*, p. 74.

Digitized by Google Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

succeeding the one dealt with in the present Revels Book. But, although Malone apparently had seen it, this document was practically unknown to scholars until published in the New Shakespeare Society's *Transactions* in 1876. There are even reasons for believing that Cunningham when he prepared the *Revels Accounts* for the press was ignorant of its existence. Though it bears evidence that *The Maid's Tragedy* was a King's Men's play, Cunningham, as we have seen, assigns that play to the Lady Elizabeth's men.

It is noteworthy, though possibly the fact will only serve to confirm Mrs Stopes's suspicions, that all the King's Men's plays mentioned in the Revels Book of 1611–12 recur on Stanhope's list. There is the still further analogy that in both lists one play is recorded twice, but under different names, i.e., once under its title and once under its sub-title. Thus on St John's night, 1611, we have *The City Gallant* (by the Queen's Men) and on Candlemas night, 1612, *Tu Coque*. In the later list we first get *ffilaster* and afterwards *Love lyes a-bleeding*. Viewed conjunctively, these disguised repetitions cannot be taken as simple blundering. They imply some sort of a clerical system in connexion with repeated plays; and the very iteration of the trick seems to plead on behalf of the genuineness of the second impugned Revels Book.

If the record of the Greenwich performance of *The Silver Age* 'by the Queens Players and the Kings Players' (unitedly) be a forgery, it is surprising that Cunningham, when writing his notes, made no attempt to elucidate so uncommon and puzzling an entry. Had he been acquainted with it, it would have been a simple matter to have quoted from Heywood's address to the reader in the 1632 quarto of *The Iron Age*:

> These Ages have beene long since Writ, and suited with the Time then..... I desire thee to take notice, that these were the Playes often (and not with the least applause) Publickely Acted by two Companies vppon one Stage at once, and have at sundry times thronged three seuerall Theatres, with numerous and mighty Auditories.

So far from having forged the item on the strength of this (the only corroborative) evidence, Cunningham shows by his silence that the item had baffled him. It is odd to find Mrs Stopes claiming that Heywood's statement has pertinence only to public performances, and does not admit of wider application. As if a play like *The Silver Age*, having so long a list of *dramatis personae* that it demanded the strength of two companies for its normal performance, could have been given at court by a single company[1]!

[1] Luckily, just as I was engaged in correcting the proofs of this article, a friend drew my attention to Malone's vital note on the flyleaf of his copy of *The Silver Age* (Q. 1613), now preserved in the Bodleian (shelf-mark, 'Malone 248'):

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

But, to my mind, the one particular item establishing the genuineness of the present Revels Book is the record of the performance on Shrove Monday of 'a playe called Himens Holiday' by the Duke of York's players. Since *Hymen's Holiday or Cupid's Vagaries* was never printed, it was impossible for Cunningham, viewing the comparatively limited knowledge possessed by scholars of his period, to approximate the date of the play or to arrive at anything more concerning it than the details quoted by him from Herbert on p. 226, viz., that it was acted at court by the Queen's men on December 16, 1633, and was a well-liked 'ould play of Rowley's.' But there were two Rowleys and Fleay was the first to demonstrate that the author was Will Rowley. Now what do we find? That Will Rowley was one of the original patentees of the Duke of York's Company in 1610 and head of that company at the time of the performances under discussion[1].

(III.) The King's Men's Court List, 1636.

There is absolutely no reason for entertaining suspicion of the genuineness of this document. It cannot be pretended that it was manufactured to prove anything. Cunningham gave it to the world (p. xxiv) with but trivial comment, nothing beyond four brief notes relative to the authorship of certain plays. His silence is again eloquent. He did not know exactly what it was, had no conception of its historical value. Nor is Mrs Stopes, after the lapse of three quarters of a century, in any better case. Instead of recognizing it for what it plainly is, a furnished account of King's Men's court plays, she calls it 'the list of the Revels Book' and follows up her erroneous conception by condemning it for irregularity of form. There is rank injustice here, not only to Cunningham but to the cause of historical truth. One speaks decisively on this point because, by a stroke of good fortune, another King's Men's account of a slightly later period has come down to us, and, as it happens, the two are mutually elucidative. Curiously enough, this second account suffered much the same misfortune as the first. Discovered more than half a century ago by the late George R. Wright, F.S.A., doubtless an antiquary of some competence but one absolutely devoid of theatrical knowledge, it was published by him in facsimile in *The Journal of the British Archæological Association* for 1860, p. 275, together with a

'This play was performed at Greenwich before the King and Queen "by the Queen's Players and the King's men" in Jan^{y} 1611–12, as appears from the Accounts of Sir George Buc, Master of the Revels.'

Strange to say, this is only one of several important records which Malone unearthed and never published!

[1] J. T. Murray, *English Dramatic Companies*, pp. 230–1.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

commentary so erroneous in its deductions and so confusing in its import that until a lustrum ago[1] the value of the document remained completely obscured. Yet there was no need for puzzlement over the list: it is simply a furnished account of the plays given before the King and Queen by the King's Players at court and elsewhere in 1638–9.

The misfortune of Mrs Stopes's view that the actors' list of 1636 is a pretended Revels list is that she has been moved to compare it with Herbert's defective list for the same period, as if the Revels Books were its only possible basis. And, since a case has to be made out at all hazards, she views the enumeration in the impugned document of nine more plays than are to be found in Herbert as proof positive of forgery. All she really succeeds in proving is (what a good many scholars know already) that Herbert, as we have him—wholly at second hand and mostly in the slipshod transcriptions of Malone—is neither accurate nor complete. Though Herbert has no record of the Hampton Court performance of *The Moore of Venice* on December 8, 1636, we know that the play had been recently revived, since, according to the note in his diary, Sir Humphrey Mildmay saw it at the Blackfriars on May 6, 1635.

What a pity it is to find Mrs Stopes going to immense pains to prove that the King could not possibly have been at Hampton Court on certain of the dates on which plays are listed. Never, perhaps, was there better example of misdirected energies. There was no necessity for the King to be present on those particular nights. The period was one of plague, and the King's Players had been in residence at Hampton Court from November 1, as the royal warrant granting them an allowance of £20 per week for board and lodging shows. There was no reason why a play or two should not have been given before the Queen and her ladies during the temporary absence of the King on Privy Council duties. As a matter of fact, one of the items (by far the most important) on the list deals with a performance given before the Queen alone:

> The 5th of May at the Blackfryers for the Queene and the prince Elector *Alfonso.*

The play mentioned was doubtless Chapman's *Alphonsus, Emperor of Germany*, which, when first printed in 1654, bore the intimation, 'often acted with great applause in Black Fryars.' But the chief value of this item lies in its being the earliest record of the visit of English royalty to a public theatre. Though Charles II was the first English monarch to condescend to visit the players in their own habitat, there

[1] See J. Q. Adams, *Shakespearean Playhouses*, pp. 402–4, for a type-reproduction and excursus.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

can be little doubt that the way had been pioneered for him by his mother a quarter of a century earlier. For our knowledge on this score we are not wholly dependent upon the challenged third document, since in the Players' List of 1638–9 we have the item:

> At the blackfryers the 23 of Aprill for the queene the unfortunate lovers.

Mrs Stopes' final pages are positively strewn with error, speciousness and rank illogicality. There is implication of the pressure of superior odds in this ceasing to play the game, and there is nothing for it but to make liberal use of the whistle. Mrs Stopes insists on p. 31 that Herbert 'gives no locality' for the performance of *Rollo*, but a reference to his list shows that it bears the general heading, 'At Hampton Court, 1636[1].' This may be deemed a triviality, merely one more example of her characteristic carelessness of statement, but graver misrepresentation follows. The story of Cartwright's *The Royal Slave*, never yet accurately told, is again retold in the old confusing way and with accretive misconceptions. Stiff as is the task, one must now undertake the loosening of the tangle.

Driven out of London in the summer of 1636 by plague, the King and Queen visited Oxford and, on August 30, were entertained at Christ Church by students who then produced *The Royal Slave* with well-nigh unexampled sumptuousness. Rich Persian costumes were provided; there was elaborate scenery by Inigo Jones; and dispersed between the acts were *intermedii* of the Italian order with music by Henry Lawes. So enraptured was the Queen by the performance, that in November she wrote to the Chancellor desiring that the scenery and dresses should be sent to Hampton Court, 'to the end that she might see her own Players act it over again, and whether they could do it as well as 'twas done by the University[2].' Wood goes on to say that the request was immediately complied with, and continues, 'so that all of it being fitted for use (the author thereof being present) 'twas acted soon after, but, by all men's confession, the Players came short of the University actors.'

Wood evidently derived his information from Laud's Diary, on which Mrs Stopes more directly bases, but, whoever was primarily responsible for the statement that the Queen's own players acted the play at Hampton Court, the statement is wrong and has misled all succeeding writers. Mrs Stopes—for once, strangely enough, disputing the accuracy of the much-lauded Herbert—assumes a production of *The Royal Slave* at Hampton Court by the Queen's Men in November and thinks the

[1] Adams, *Dramatic Records*, p. 57.
[2] Wood, *Hist. and Antiq. Univ. Oxford*, 1796, II, 410.

Digitized by Google Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

King's Men repeated the play there a month or two later in competition with the other company. This is a wholly erroneous view. Let it be said now once for all that only a single performance of *The Royal Slave* was given at Hampton Court, that the date (on the combined authority of Herbert and the present Players' List) was January 12, 1636–7, and that the players (on the same authority) were the King's Men. If the play were first acted or acted at all there by the Queen's Men, it is remarkable the fact should have been ignored when the quarto of 1639 came to be printed. It speaks of 'the King's Servants' alone as the court producers.

Nor is this all. Mrs Stopes, in her overwhelming desire to destroy this unoffending document, refuses to be convinced by the unanimity of the two authorities as to the date of the King's Men's performance, and cites from a contemporary newsletter to show that it took place, not on January 12, but on Twelfth Night. There can be little doubt, let the mistake have been made how it might, that the newsletter-writer blundered. Mrs Stopes can only account for the discrepancy by postulating the inaccuracy of the very authority she has previously rated impeccable, the touchstone, to her mind, whereby dubious things might be tested. But she surely does not expect to have it both ways. Malone, we are told (p. 33), was a careless transcriber, and in copying Herbert he might readily 'have misread Twelfth Night into Twelfth January.' Quite so: but, as it happens, what Malone transcribed was 'thursday the 12th of Janu,' and the preceding Twelfth Night fell on a Friday.

W. J. Lawrence.

Oxford.

Digitized by Google

Original from
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

LES NOUVELLES LOIS PHONÉTIQUES DE MR NICHOLSON.

DANS le numéro d'avril 1922 de cette revue, Mr Weekley, avec sa grande compétence de philologue, a souligné tout l'intérêt que comporte pour les étymologistes le beau travail de Mr Nicholson, si plein d'audaces et dont le modeste titre, *Recherches Philologiques Romanes*, dissimule la plus riche contribution apportée depuis bien des années aux études étymologiques par un seul érudit. En effet, les mots que Mr Nicholson a étudiés et pour lesquels il nous a apporté une solution presque toujours vraisemblable, sinon toujours définitive, ne sont pas des vocables obscurs de quelque lointain dialecte, mais sont de ceux-là, au contraire, qui forment comme la trame du français usuel, tels les mots *aller*, *trouver*, *soigner*, *tromper*, *ôter*, *sortir*, *joli*, *mauvais*, *sot*, *gai*, *vite*, *mot*, *air*, mots, d'ailleurs, dont l'étymologie a suscité parmi les romanistes les plus vives controverses. Mais Mr Nicholson, et je le regrette, n'a pas cru bon de résumer dans un chapitre spécial les nouvelles lois qu'il a formulées, pas plus que les résultats généraux de ses recherches; d'autre part, il y a dans son livre un tel amoncellement de faits, une telle accumulation de détails, qu'on a du mal à y voir clair. Ce sera le but de cet article de combler cette lacune et de grouper les nouvelles lois qu'il a énoncées, en les soumettant à une critique qui se voudrait aussi utile que bienveillante. Pour ce qui est des étymologies, je me propose d'y revenir par la suite et de formuler sur certaines d'entre elles des réserves qu'une lecture très attentive de son livre m'a suggérées.

Les étymologies de Mr Nicholson peuvent se classer en trois catégories: d'abord, celles qui résultent d'une application de lois admises et dites régulières; puis, celles qui sont nées d'une étude clairvoyante de mots dont l'étymologie est évidente et reconnue mais qui figurent, dans les traités de grammaire historique, parmi les mots 'isolés' ou 'rares'; enfin, celles, de beaucoup les plus nombreuses, qui ressortent d'une application de lois nouvelles, découvertes et formulées pour la première fois par l'auteur. Avant de passer à la discussion de ces nouvelles lois, disons que ces trois catégories comprennent un nombre inattendu de mots qui se seraient dégagés d'autres mots par l'aphérèse de la syllabe initiale (*trencher* de *entrenchier*, *tresser* de *estrécier* etc.), celle-ci étant

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

envisagée par le sujet parlant comme le premier élément d'un dérivé et comme identique, soit à un préfixe (*en*, *es*), soit à un mot indépendant (*tost* de *tantost*). Bien que nous n'acceptions pas pour les mots qui composeraient ce groupe toutes les conclusions de Mr Nicholson, il n'en reste pas moins vrai que c'est là tout un petit chapitre à ajouter à l'histoire de la formation des mots français.

Là où Mr Nicholson s'écarte de la phonétique traditionnelle, il y a lieu de distinguer entre les rectifications et précisions nouvelles, apportées à des lois généralement admises, et les innovations intégrales; les premières ont trait au développement des groupes *cs*, *ct*, du groupe *rs*, de *c* suivi d'une voyelle prépalatale et de *f* précédée d'une sonnante, les dernières à celui de *f* et de *v*.

I. Le groupe *ct*. La rectification que Mr Nicholson croit devoir apporter à la loi du développement de ce groupe est formulée à la page 112 de son livre: 'Dans le groupe *ct*, nous dit-il, précédé d'une voyelle en latin vulgaire, *c* passe à *i* s'il est frappé de l'accent tonique et disparaît dans les autres cas sans laisser de traces. Par exemple **afactare* devient régulièrement **afater*, tandis que **afactat* passe à **afaytat* > *afaite*.' Il cite à l'appui de cette doctrine *lectrinum* > vfr. *letrin*. Les exceptions seraient dues au jeu de l'analogie: vfr. *peitrine* et *peitral* auraient ainsi subi l'influence analogique de *pectus* > *piz*. Mr Nicholson a besoin de cette 'loi' pour étayer son étymologie *ahatir* < *afactire*; mais on n'acceptera pas sa rectification sans réserves. Il est certes difficile, dans des cas comme *factorem* > *faiteur*, *lactuca* > *laitue*, *tractare* > *traitier*, *allactare* > *allaitier*, de nier la possibilité d'une influence analogique des formes à radical accentué, mais que dirons-nous de mots comme *Pictavu* > *Poitou*, *vectura* > *voiture*, et comment, en outre, ne pas s'étonner du fait que de tous les verbes qui contiennent le groupe *ct*, on n'en voit pas un seul dont le radical varie selon l'incidence de l'accent tonique, alors que, pour les autres verbes, cette alternance, sous le jeu de l'ictus, est chose si fréquente? Quant à *lectrinum* > *letrin*, rien ne nous empêche d'alléguer ici l'influence analogique de *lettre* (cf. vfr. *letres aprendre* 'apprendre à lire'), et Mr Nicholson aurait été mieux fondé peut-être à citer *fluctuare* > *flotter*, *ructare* > *roter*, quoique, là encore, l'apophonie si caractéristique de l'ancienne langue fasse également défaut.

II. Le groupe *cs*. Pour ce groupe, Mr Nicholson pose un développement analogue à celui du groupe *ct*. Ce postulat, il a oublié de le formuler, mais c'est le seul qui puisse justifier son étymologie *trousser* < (*es*)*trosser* < **struxare*, le vieux français, que je sache, ne possédant

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

pas de forme à désinence palatalisée, soit (*es*)*trossier* ou (*es*)*troissier* (cf. *laxare* > *laissier*). Ici encore, et songeant, entre autres, aux mots *maxilla* > *maissele*, *axilla* > *aisselle*, *paxillu* > *paissel*, je voudrais formuler les mêmes réserves sur la validité ou, pour le moins, sur l'universalité de cette 'loi.'

III. Traitement du *c* suivi d'une voyelle prépalatale (*e, i*) et devenu final en français. A l'article *eneveis* < *in hac vice* (p. 51) Mr Nicholson étudie 'le problème que présente dans le plus ancien français *pais* (*pacem*), *dis* (*decem*) à côté des mots *feiz*, *voiz*, *croiz*, *noiz* (*nucem*), *peiz* (*picem*).' Il croit que 'dans ces mots, comme partout ailleurs après une voyelle, les groupes *ce, ci* ont donné *is*; cf. *racemum* > *raisin*, *vicinum* > *veisin*,' et que, dans tous les cas du singulier, on a commencé par dire *pais*, *veis*, *vois*, *crois*, *nois*, *peis*. 'Mais au pluriel il se présentait en latin vulgaire une influence troublante: au groupe *ce* du cas sujet et du cas régime, il se substituait *cj* dans tous les autres cas...Ainsi, par exemple, tandis que *nuces* passait à *nois*, **nucjo* (de *nucium*) et **nucjos* (de *nucibus*) tendaient à donner *noz*; cf. *brachium* > **bracjo* > *braz*.' De cette lutte de formes, il résulte que des formes à diphthongue et avec *z* (*ts*) ont évincé les autres, ceci en vertu d'une loi formulée ailleurs et qui veut que, toutes choses égales d'ailleurs, de plusieurs formes concurrentes, c'est celle qui contient le plus grand nombre de sons qui l'emporte sur les autres. Or, quiconque connaît tant soit peu les efforts que prodigue la langue pour secourir ses 'mutilés phonétiques' admettra sans peine, en principe, cette dernière loi de Mr Nicholson; mais encore faut-il qu'il y ait concurrence réelle, qu'il y ait lutte à forces égales ou presque égales? Mr Nicholson croit-il pouvoir affirmer qu'à l'époque de la palatalisation du *c* devant *e, i*, les formes caduques *nucium*, *nucibus* conservaient encore assez de vitalité pour exercer une influence sur des formes aussi vigoureuses que les représentants de **nucis*, *nucem*, *nuces*? Et, pour que les faibles eussent ainsi triomphé des forts, n'aurait-il pas fallu que ceux-ci fussent entachés de quelque vice essentiel, qu'ils se fussent trouvés, par exemple, sous la menace de quelque homonymie délétère contre laquelle il fallait à toute force réagir? Mr Nicholson nous dit seulement que les formes *nucium*, *nucibus* 'n'ont certainement pas disparu du jour au lendemain,' sans préciser davantage. Cependant, j'en conviens, sa thèse trouve un certain appui dans le fait que ce sont les mots *decem* et *pacem*, le premier invariable, le second peu ou pas usité au pluriel, qui se présentent avec *s* et non *z*. *Ecce* > **eke* > *es* méritait peut-être également d'être cité à ce propos.

IV. *F* précédée d'une sonnante. C'est pour appuyer son étymologie

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

malvais, mauvais < *malefacens* (p. 163) que Mr Nicholson formule la loi suivante : '*F* devient *v* en latin vulgaire quand elle est précédée immédiatement par une sonnante. Dans cette position *f* est initiale et par conséquent se maintient à peu près toujours intacte par l'analogie de la forme simple. C'est, par exemple, l'existence du verbe simple pr. *far*, it. *fare* qui empêche les composés *calfar, calfare* < *calefacere* de devenir *calvar, calvare*; le fr. *chauffer* est un mot emprunté au provençal.' Il faudrait plus qu'une simple affirmation pour faire admettre un emprunt si étonnant et on trouvera plus vraisemblable la supposition que c'est *calvum* > *chauf, chauve* qui aurait empêché la loi, si loi il y a, de fonctionner. Celle-ci, d'ailleurs, même pour Mr Nicholson, est d'une portée des plus restreintes, car il ne cite comme exemples de son influence que l'ait. (lomb.) *malveghera*, dérivé de *maleficus* 'sorcier,' et l'aesp. *malvar* < **malfare* 'rendre méchant.' Ce primitif, l'espagnol l'aurait emprunté au domaine provençal ou italien ; il aurait échappé sur le sol ibérique à l'influence du verbe simple. Le provençal, de son côté, aurait emprunté son mot *malvado* à l'espagnol. Tout ce chassé-croisé d'emprunts aurait grand besoin d'être motivé, vu, surtout, que l'ancien espagnol possède, à côté de la forme *fazer*, l'infinitif *far*.

V. Le groupe *rs*. Quant au développement de ce groupe, voici la précision que Mr Nicholson apporte (p. 125) aux dires assez hésitants de ses devanciers : 'Je crois, nous dit-il, qu'il s'agit d'une loi qu'on pourrait formuler ainsi : *r* tombe en latin vulgaire, et même plus tard, dans le groupe *rs* quand l'*s* vient à se trouver dans la même syllabe que l'*r*.' Mr Nicholson a peut-être raison, mais en lisant son article, on se demande, tout en admirant l'ingéniosité de ses explications des nombreuses exceptions à sa 'loi,' si, devant la diversité et l'enchevêtrement des faits, cette loi possède plus qu'une valeur purement académique. De toute façon, son étymologie *revéche* < vfr. *reveschier* < **reversicare* s'appuie sur des bases sémantiques assez solides pour n'avoir nullement besoin de ce soutien tant soit peu chancelant.

VI. Les innovations intégrales : traitement de *f* et de *v*. Voici les nouvelles lois qui ont fourni à Mr Nicholson son plus riche butin étymologique :

1. Dans le domaine français, *f* initiale, devenue intervocalique dans un composé, se change en *h* si elle est suivie d'une voyelle labiale ; cette *h* s'efface si elle se trouve entre deux voyelles labiales et se maintient dans les autres cas (p. 57).

2. Entre deux voyelles identiques en latin vulgaire, *f* et *v* (même s'ils ont été initiaux à l'origine) passent (*v* par l'intermédiaire de *f*) en

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

galloroman à *h*, qui disparaît si les deux voyelles restent identiques ou sont labiales et qui se maintient dans les autres cas (p. 82).

Ces lois sont la moelle substantielle du livre. Je voudrais, avant de les discuter, souligner toute leur importance en dressant une liste des étymologies qu'elles servent à établir. Les voici :

1. *ahurter* < **afurtare* ; *dehurter* < **defurtare* ; *ahurir* < **afurire* ; *soignier* < **sufungi* ; *besoignier* < **benèsufungi* ; *souiller* < **sufodiculare* ; *souler, chouler* < **sufullare* ; *sonder* < **sufundare* ; *aoschier* < **adofuscare* ; puis, par voie de l'aphérèse de la syllabe initiale *hurter, heurter* < *ahurter* ; *hurer* < **ahurer* < **afurare* ; *humer* < **ahumer* < **afumare* ; *hogner, hoignier, foignier* < **sofoignier*, **sohoignier* < *sufungi* ; *houille* < **houiller* < **sohoillier* < **sufodiculare* ; *houler* < **souhouler* < **sufullare* ; *hustiner* < **ahustiner* < **afustiner* ; puis enfin, par dérivation postverbale, *hure* ; *soin* ; *besoin* ; *houille* ; *houle*, etc.

2. *ahaner* < **avannare* ; *soner, seoner* < **subvannare* ; *aire, air, here, haire* < **afacere* ; *ahait, hait, (sou)hait* < **afactum* ; *aaisier* < *aaisant* < **afacentem* ; *ahatir, aatir, atir* (> *atirer*) < **afactire* ; *attifer* < **aatif* < **afactivum* ; *réche, revéche* < *reveschier* < **reversicare* ; vfr. *dehoisier* et *desgoisier* < **disvitiare* ; vfr. *mais* (adj.) < *malefacens* ; *aller, affaler* < **avallare* ; *dalle* < *daler* < **de-avallare* ; vfr. *daillier* < **de-avalliare* ; *caler* < **co-avallare* ; *râler* < **re-avallare*, *rôder* < **re-avallitare* ; *effarer* < **ex-warare* ; *issin, aissin, ensin* < *in-sic-fine* ; *gierre* < *ea re vera* ; puis, par voie de l'aphérèse, *tirer* ; *tifer* ; *haler* < **ahaler* < **avallare* ; *harnais* < *aharneschier* < **awarniskare* ; *farder, harder* < **awardare* ; *hanter* < **awantare* ; *harer* < **awarare* (d'où aussi *haras* < **warakeum*) ; puis, en outre, une foule nombreuse de dérivés, tant postverbaux qu'autres et qu'il serait peut-être excessif de rapporter ici.

Présentée ainsi, sans les preuves sémantiques que Mr Nicholson a amassées, cette liste est faite pour nous étonner plutôt que pour nous convaincre, mais, telle quelle, elle doit inspirer dans tout esprit non prévenu un vif désir d'examiner le bien-fondé des lois qui en font la base.

Avant de passer à l'étude détaillée de ces lois, signalons quelques lacunes qui se trouvent dans l'exposé de Mr Nicholson. On eût voulu, d'abord, qu'il nous expliquât le processus phonétique de ce passage insolite d'une sonore intervocalique à une sourde (*v* à *f*), passage tout à fait contraire à la vocalisation progressive des sourdes intervocaliques qui fait loi dans la phonétique galloromane ; qu'il nous donnât des exemples d'un changement analogue dans d'autres langues ; qu'il nous dît pourquoi ce changement se ferait uniquement entre des voyelles identiques, et quelle influence a pu empêcher *lavare* de passer à *lafer*,

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

laher et *cavare* (vfr. *chaver*) à *chafer*, *chaher*. On regrette, en outre, qu'il ait passé sous silence la question importante de la chronologie de ses lois, car, pour le lecteur, il est fort malaisé de s'en faire une idée très nette d'après les formes intermédiaires à astérisque disséminées dans le livre. Nous trouvons, par exemple, dans deux articles successifs, des postulats qui paraissent contradictoires. Dans le premier, il est dit que *fustiner* a fort bien pu être formé sur le vfr. *fuster* pour devenir par la suite *hustiner* (je fais remarquer en passant qu'ici *f* serait devenu *h* à l'initiale, sans se trouver dans un composé, ce qui est contraire à la première loi), tandis que dans le second, nous voyons le passage de *f* à *h* se placer à une époque bien antérieure, à en juger d'après la série suivante de formes hypothétiques **adofuscare* > **adohoscare* > **adooscare* > *aoschier*. Ailleurs (p. 200), nous voyons une forme française avec *v* figurer comme origine d'un mot français sans *v*, dans la série *râler* < **raaler* < **rahaler* < *ravaler*. La question chronologique reste donc un peu vague. On peut, cependant, arriver à quelques précisions.

Le fait que les mots germaniques sont passibles du même traitement du *v* (médial ou initial) que subissent les mots d'origine latine, indiquerait la persistance jusqu'à une date très tardive de l'opération des lois. D'autre part, le mot *afannae* 'paroles vides de sens,' employé par Apulée, et qui est rattaché, avec raison sans doute, à **avannare*, paraît prouver que *v* est passé à *f* dans le domaine français avant le milieu du IIe siècle. Enfin, la glose '*transgredere*: *ultra alare* (**avallare*)' du glossaire de Reichenau, que Mr Nicholson n'a pas mentionnée, nous montre tous les changements déjà accomplis. Il s'agirait donc de lois dont l'opération se ferait sentir pendant quelque cinq ou six siècles. Mr Nicholson accepte-t-il ces conclusions ? Ajoutons que, vu par exemple l'importance qu'on attache aux considérations ethniques dans l'histoire de la prononciation française de l'*u* latin, elles ne sont pas à priori dépourvues de toute probabilité.

Pour en venir aux lois elles-mêmes, une première chose nous gêne, c'est la restriction du passage de *f* à *h* et de *v* à *f* > *h* à la position intervocalique. Cette restriction non seulement oblige Mr Nicholson à faire des hypothèses assez invraisemblables, telle, par exemple, son explication de l'*f* de l'anglo-saxon *fann* 'van,' emprunté très anciennement au roman, par l'influence de **afannare* < **avannare*, mais l'entraîne parfois dans des erreurs de raisonnement. En voici un exemple. Mr Nicholson identifie le vfr. *hart* avec le francique *ward*, et considère comme très significatif le fait que le mot français est du féminin, comme les congénères germaniques de *ward*, l'ags. *weard* et l'aha. *warta*, alors que tous

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

les autres mots français à terminaison consonnantique, à l'exception du seul mot *part*, sont du masculin. L'identité sémantique est en effet incontestable. Or, de deux choses l'une: si *wart* est devenu *hart*, le mot français ne peut pas devoir son *h* au fait de s'être dégagé d'un composé où le *w* se serait trouvé en position intervocalique, ou, inversement, si *hart* s'est dégagé d'un composé il ne peut pas devoir son genre féminin au primitif francique. C'est pourquoi, convaincu de la large part de vérité que renferment les théories de Mr Nicholson, et voulant les débarrasser de la gêne de cette restriction (combien plus vraisemblable, par exemple, serait la série ags. *fann*, *vanne*, *hane*, *fanon*, vfr. *hanon*, *hanel* si elle était tirée de *vannus* sans composé !), j'ai songé à rechercher si, dans le domaine de la toponymie française, on pouvait découvrir quelque trace du développement *f* > *h*. Ce sont les résultats de cette enquête que je voudrais maintenant exposer. Ils permettent, je crois, d'établir que, pour l'*f* du moins, cette restriction n'est nullement nécessaire.

On me dispensera sans doute d'insister sur l'étroite parenté qui relie les deux spirantes *f* et *h*[1]. La phonétique de l'espagnol et, sur le sol galloroman, du gascon, en fournit le plus éloquent témoignage, lequel se complète utilement, d'autre part, par le passage, dans certains mots germaniques, des sons *hl*, *hr*, à *fl*, *fr* (cf. *Hluthberth* > *Flobert*; *hrim* > *frim*(*as*), etc., et de l'anglais *wh* (pron. *hw*) à *f* dans le nord de l'Écosse (cf. angl. *what*, écoss. dial. *fat*). Pour le français, le cas de *foris* > *hors* est d'une authenticité indiscutable, quelle que soit, d'ailleurs, la façon dont on voudrait l'expliquer. La preuve que ce n'est pas là un cas unique nous sera fournie par l'étude d'un des plus anciens noms de lieu latins appartenant à la toponymie galloromane, le mot *Fines*.

On ne compte pas moins de dix-sept Fines parmi les noms de lieu que nous ont transmis les textes itinéraires de l'époque romaine. C'étaient des stations qui se trouvaient à la limite de deux cités ou de deux provinces, le plus souvent, dit Longnon[2], de simples relais de poste qui n'ont pas survécu à la chute de l'empire romain et dont deux seuls auraient conservé, plus ou moins altérée, leur appellation primitive. Ce sont Pfyn, en Thurgovie, Suisse, et Fismes, ville du département de la Marne. Je voudrais prouver qu'à ces deux, il faut en ajouter un troisième, dont le nom a revêtu au point de vue phonétique une forme des plus significatives.

Des dix-sept Fines mentionnés plus haut, deux nous sont fournis par la pierre milliaire qu'on connaît sous le nom de 'septemvium de Tongres,'

[1] Cf. pour le latin Seelmann, E., *Aussprache des Latein*, p. 300.
[2] *Les Noms de Lieu de la France*, p. 108.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

comme étant, l'un entre Durocortorum et Augusta Suessionum (c'est le moderne Fismes, à la limite des diocèses de Reims et de Soissons), l'autre, celui qui nous intéresse plus particulièrement, entre Castellum et Nemetacus, c'est-à-dire, entre Cassel et Arras, à une distance de quatorze lieues gauloises du premier[1]. Longnon, *Atlas de la Gaule* (*Texte*), p. 28, pose l'emplacement de ce Fines à Pont-du-Han, communes de Laventie et de Richebourg-Saint-Vaast (Pas-de-Calais). Or, à mi-chemin, à peu près, entre Cassel et Arras, et sur l'axe même qui réunit ces deux villes, se trouve la commune de Hinges, située sur un coteau de 40 mètres 'qui domine les immenses plaines humides et basses de Béthune, au-dessus et près du canal d'Aire à la Bassée[2].'

L'importance stratégique de cet endroit saute aux yeux quand on regarde la carte de l'état-major. C'est comme un avant-poste des collines de l'Artois dans les marécages de la Flandre française. Entre Hinges et la butte de Cassel, pas une hauteur qui dépasse 20 mètres. A l'époque romaine, Béthune, à cinq kilomètres au sud de Hinges, était déjà un important carrefour de routes, et le centre d'une région assez fortement peuplée, à en juger par les vestiges nombreux de la civilisation gallo-romaine qu'on a découverts, tant à Béthune même que dans les communes avoisinantes. Hinges était admirablement situé pour la surveillance des routes qui reliaient Béthune à Térouanne d'une part et à Estaires de l'autre, voies qui ne figurent pas dans les anciens itinéraires mais dont on a relevé des traces[3]. Une autre voie, venant d'Arras par Noeux et Vaudricourt, se prolongeait sans doute jusqu'à Cassel et devait côtoyer la butte de Hinges[4]. La grande route stratégique, qui faisait communiquer le Rhin avec la mer et qui réunissait Boulogne et Cologne, semble avoir bifurqué à Térouanne, pour passer, soit au sud par Arras, soit au nord par Cassel, les deux bras se réunissant de nouveau à Bavai[5]. On faisait ce détour, sans doute, pour éviter les terrains marécageux de la

[1] Voici le texte en question : A Castello Fines Atrebatum L. xiiii Nemetac. L.; le chiffre des lieues entre Fines et Nemetacus est effacé ; v. Desjardins, *Géographie de la Gaule romaine*, vol. IV, p. 31 et C. I. L., xiii, 9158.

[2] Joanne, *Dictionnaire géographique...de la France*, *s.v.* Hinges.

[3] Terninck, A., *L'Artois souterrain*, 3 vol. (Arras, 1878–80).

[4] Cf. Cumont, F., *Comment la Belgique fut romanisée*, p. 16.

[5] Sur cette route v. Cumont, *op. cit.*, pp. 13–17. Il y a lieu de rechercher à ce propos si le nom de Hingeon ne serait pas un dérivé de Hinges, tout comme Hingette. Ce dernier se trouve à côté de Hinges. Hingeon est un village situé à 12 km. au nord-est de Namur sur la route de St Trond, à une altitude de 210 mètres. A partir de cet endroit la route, qui depuis Namur n'a cessé de monter, descend doucement vers le nord. D'après le tracé de la route romaine Bavai-Cologne que donne Cumont, celle-ci devait passer par Hingeon, mais les moyens de faire la vérification me manquent ici. Toujours est-il que l'emplacement de Hingeon correspond exactement à celui de Faimbe (Doubs), qui se trouve à 800 mètres d'une ancienne voie romaine et dont le nom paraît bien recéler un ancien Finibus : cf. plus bas.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

vallée de la Lys. Mais il est permis de supposer qu'en certaines saisons de l'année, il y avait communication directe entre Térouanne et Bavai. Dans ce cas, il fallait passer dans le voisinage immédiat de Hinges, qui se trouve exactement sur l'axe de ces deux villes. Autre fait significatif, Hinges, qui relève du diocèse d'Arras, se trouve tout près de la limite du diocèse de St Omer, et on sait que les limites des diocèses représentent d'anciennes limites administratives romaines. Ajoutez à tout cela que la distance de Cassel, 27·3 km. à vol d'oiseau, représente assez exactement la route de xiiii lieues (30·8 km.)[1] du septemvium et on est presque obligé de conclure que le poste de Hinges qui, par la force des choses, devait être un Fines, un poste de frontière, est bien celui du septemvium. Mais que faut-il dire de la forme *Hinges*?

Elle peut parfaitement s'expliquer. Pour rendre compte de la forme *Fismes*, dont la plus ancienne graphie fournie par le *Dictionnaire topographique de la France* est *Fimmes* (datée 907), on a recours à la forme latine *Finibus*, forme qui, de même que *Ad Fines*, se trouve quelquefois dans les itinéraires[2]. C'est là, évidemment, un cas de la généralisation, fréquente dans un nom de lieu, de la forme du locatif (type *Remis* > *Reims*). L'*m* s'explique comme résultant du contact de l'*n* et du *b*, après la chute de l'*i* atone de la désinence[3]. Mais ce développement ne laisse pas d'être un peu irrégulier au point de vue phonétique; il ne peut se justifier que par l'hypothèse, assez vraisemblable d'ailleurs, d'une influence savante, en l'espèce, administrative, qui aurait maintenu dans ce mot la prononciation du *b* intervocalique. Car autrement, *Finibus*, dans la langue populaire, serait devenu de bonne heure **finivus*, **finijus*, pour aboutir à quoi? A *Finges* (cf. *lineum* > *linge*, *extraneum* > *estrange*, etc.). On remarquera que je n'ai pas fait précéder cette forme d'un astérisque. En effet, elle n'est pas hypothétique; c'est précisément, avec l'*s* en plus, le nom roman (suisse)[4] de la ville de Pfyn, ville qui représente le Fines placé, par l'*Itinéraire* d'Antonin, sur la route d'Augusta Vindelicorum à Trèves[5], et dont 'la situation correspondait à la limite même de la Gaule.' Ce Finge n'est pas unique. Dans le *Dictionnaire de Géographie universelle* de St Martin, au mot *Pfyn*, on voit figurer, en second lieu: 'Pfyn ou Finge. Ham. du canton du Valais (Suisse). Ancienne Fines ou limite du territoire des *Seduni* et des *Viberi*, c'est

[1] Pont-du-Han est à 28½ km. de Cassel. Dans Desjardins, *op. cit.*, p. 31, la reproduction en héliogravure du septemvium porte plutôt xiii que xiiii lieues.
[2] Longnon, *op. cit.*, p. 109.
[3] Longnon, *ibid.*
[4] V. Paul-Wissowa, *Real-Encycl.*, *s.v.* Fines.
[5] Longnon, *ibid.*

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

encore aujourd'hui la ligne de démarcation entre le Haut-Valais et le Bas-Valais, entre la langue allemande et la langue française. Forêt de pins, dite bois de *Finges*[1].'

Ainsi, on ne contestera pas, je pense, la régularité du développement *Finibus* > *Finges*[2]. Pour nier celui de *Finibus* > *Hinges*, il faudrait admettre que, par un hasard vraiment extraordinaire, ce nom de lieu, unique en France, et réunissant dans sa forme les traits phonétiques de *foris* > *hors* et *Finibus* > *Finges*, soit devenu celui d'une localité dont l'emplacement correspond à celui d'un Fines romain sans avoir avec le nom latin de cette localité aucun rapport de forme. Je n'insiste pas sur l'improbabilité d'une telle coïncidence. *Finibus* est devenu *Hinges* dans le Pas-de-Calais, comme *Fines* est devenu *Hinx* dans les Landes et *Hix* dans les Pyrénées-Orientales (identifications admises par Longnon sans témoignage ancien), par un changement phonétique de *f* en *h*[3].

Le passage de *f* à *h* est ainsi assuré pour un mot appartenant à la plus ancienne couche linguistique du galloroman, sans qu'il soit nécessaire, où même possible, pour l'expliquer, de recourir à l'hypothèse d'une position intervocalique du *f*. Envisageons maintenant, à la lumière de ce fait, quelques rapprochements de mots, avec *f* et *h* à l'initiale, que nous fournit le livre de Mr Nicholson. *Fumer* et *humer*: rapport sémantique indéniable; *furet* et *hurer* 'hérisser comme le furet'; *huron* 'mineur'; *furet* 'émétique' et *hure* 'plante purgative'; *huricle*, même sens; *fongner* et *hogner*, synonymes; *fardes* synonyme de *hardes*, *faraz* de *haraz*[4]; *foule* et *houle*, rapport de sens (le wallon a *foler* 'fouler' à côté de *holer* 'se remuer sur place'); in *fallis* seu *hallis* parisiensibus—Ducange. Est-il besoin désormais, pour expliquer ce parallélisme, de supposer avec Mr Nicholson que toutes les formes avec *h* se soient dégagées de composés où l'*f* se serait trouvée en position intervocalique? J'ose dire qu'il n'en est rien. On me demandera alors sous

[1] Y a-t-il un rapport entre ce nom et celui de la Forêt de Fanges (Aude) qui se trouve près du col St-Louis, à la limite du dép. des Pyrénées-Orientales?

[2] Un second développement serait également possible, parallèle à celui de *ba(l)neum* > *baing*, *cotoneum* > *coing*, etc. Ce serait là l'explication de la forme *Feings* (Loire-et-Cher et Orne), nom porté par deux localités qui, quoique ne figurant pas sur des itinéraires anciens, se trouvaient aux confins du diocèse de Chartres. (Cf. Longnon, *ibid.*)

[3] Je remercie mon ami Mr A. Hyslop d'avoir bien voulu rechercher dans le *Dictionnaire topographique du Pas-de-Calais*, les formes anciennes de Hinges. Le plus ancien exemple (1194) est identique à la forme moderne. Les deux suivants, *Hinghes* (XIII^e siècle) et *Hingues* (1469) m'ont d'abord inquiété. Mais en me référant au *Complément* du dictionnaire de Godefroy, *s.v. Frenge* (< *fimbria*), je fus vite rassuré. Pour ce mot, en effet, il signale les graphies suivantes: *Fringues*, août 1416, *Trésorerie des comtes de Hainaut*, et *Frinqhe*, 1442, Lille, graphies qui, par conséquent, étant de la région du nord, apportent une confirmation de la persistance, pour Hinges, de la prononciation indiquée par la forme la plus ancienne.

[4] Cf. A. Långfors, *Moyen Age*, 1922, p. 343.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

quelles conditions le passage de *f* à *h* se produit-il, et quelles seraient les raisons de la 'sporadicité' du fait? Je ne saurais répondre que par une hypothèse; mais avant de la formuler, voyons d'un peu plus près le passage de *v* à *f*.

Ce phénomène, d'après Mr Nicholson, ne se produirait qu'entre deux voyelles identiques. J'ai déjà souligné tout ce que comporte d'insolite pour le français ce passage d'une sonore à une sourde en position intervocalique. Pour réfuter cette doctrine, je ne saurais rien alléguer d'aussi précis que ce que j'ai pu rapporter pour le cas de *f* > *h*. Une enquête faite sur les noms de lieu en *v* n'a rien donné de certain. Je crois pourtant que ce changement a dû se produire à l'initiale, et pour les raisons suivantes.

Le son de la consonne ou demi-consonne figurée par *v* se distinguait déjà de celui de la voyelle représentée par le même symbole avant le milieu du deuxième siècle de notre ère. Il se prononçait, d'après le grammairien Velius Longus[1], 'cum aliqua aspiratione,' dans des mots comme *valente*, *vitulo*, *primitivo*, etc. Il me semble légitime de conclure de ce texte que c'était une consonne bilabio-vélaire légèrement aspirée. Que cette consonne, quelle qu'ait été sa vraie nature, ait passé à *f*, en pays celtique, surtout à l'initiale, il n'y aurait là rien d'étonnant. En vieil-irlandais le latin *vinum*, mot d'emprunt, devient *fin*, *versus* devient *fers*, le *v* latin subissant le même sort que le *w* indo-européen; cf. *fer*, *er*, lat. *vir*; *fir*, lat. *verus* (Pedersen, *Kelt. Gram.*, I, p. 214). Dans la même langue, *f* latin passe à *s* (*faba* > *seib*) par l'intermédiaire, non-attesté mais nécessaire, de *hw* (Pedersen, *ibid.*, p. 220).

L'hypothèse par laquelle je voudrais remplacer les lois rigides de Mr Nicholson, je la voudrais assez souple pour expliquer les faits et pour tenir compte, en même temps, de la complexité sous laquelle se présentent les réactions linguistiques qui, de tout temps, ont travaillé la langue, complexité qui s'accommode mal de l'abstraction algébrique des formules. Nos conceptions de la vie organique de la langue ont été singulièrement élargies et enrichies par les beaux travaux de M. Gilliéron. Il nous a montré que la symétrie apparente du français est souvent une symétrie de pure façade; que sous cette belle surface il y a tout un travail en profondeur, travail dont il transparaît peu de traces au dehors, mais qui a fait et qui fait la véritable vie de la langue et qu'aucune formule, phonétique ou autre, ne saurait traduire de façon définitive. Ce qui est vrai pour le français doit être aussi vrai pour le galloroman. La symétrie, la belle ordonnance de la langue, telle que

[1] Cit. Seelmann, *op. cit.*, p. 232.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

celle-ci apparaît au XII^e^ siècle, ne découvre que peu de traces de l'élaboration séculaire dont elle est le produit. La romanisation de la Gaule ne fut pas l'œuvre d'un jour, ni même d'un siècle. Il ne faut pas l'envisager comme une implantation unique de sons et de vocables dans un terrain préparé, tels des plants dans une pépinière, qui poussent tous au même niveau, dans un alignement parfait. Ce fut au contraire une lente culture d'un sol souvent ingrat, où, sous l'œil vigilant du jardinier, il a fallu élaguer, déraciner même, mainte croissance malvenue ou monstrueuse.

C'est ainsi qu'il me semble permis de supposer que dans la Gaule, pendant plusieurs siècles, il y eut une forte tendance à aspirer les consonnes bi-labiales *f*[1] et *v*, tendance née d'habitudes de prononciation celtiques. Grâce à cette aspiration *v* passait à *hw*, puis à *hf* et, rencontrant ici l'*f* primitive, devenue également *hf*, tendait avec celle-ci à passer à *h*. Cette tendance faisait sentir son influence non pas avec la régularité d'une 'loi' phonétique, mais sporadiquement, avec une intensité et une uniformité qui variaient selon les régions et les milieux sociaux. Elle rencontrait, d'autre part, une résistance continuelle, appuyée, celle-ci, de tout le poids de la latinité officielle, qui rétablissait sans cesse une 'bonne' prononciation. Mais de même qu'il nous reste encore dans la langue des traces de la prononciation *z* pour *r* entre voyelles, prononciation qui faisait rage dans certains milieux au XVI^e^ siècle et qui nous a valu la très utile forme *chaise*, de même certains mots auraient échappé à cette rectification ancienne. Dans des mots composés, par exemple, il suffirait que le sentiment de la composition se fût perdu ou que le simple mot n'existât plus (tel, peut-être, *paraveredum*> *palefroi*) pour que la rectification ne fût pas faite; c'est ce qui expliquerait que c'est surtout dans des mots composés que Mr Nicholson a relevé des traces de ces 'anormalités' phonétiques. Pour lui emprunter une série: *vannu* aurait passé à **fannu* (emprunté par l'ags. et l'aha.); une 'bonne' prononciation ramène *vannu*, mais ceci n'empêche pas **afannare*, pourvu désormais d'un sens figuré qui ne le rattache pas visiblement à *vannu*, de passer à *ahaner*, ni même d'autres dérivés de **fannu* de se développer de façon analogue. Quant aux mots simples, la rectification serait ici de règle. On conçoit cependant que la langue ait parfois gardé des formes 'irrégulières,' soit à côté des formes rectifiées, soit au détriment de celles-ci, et qu'elle s'en soit servie, tantôt, avec un sens dérivé, pour combler une lacune (*humer* à côté de *fumer*), tantôt, peut-être, pour éviter quelque homonymie (? *hors* pour *fors*, qui dans

[1] On sait que l'*f* était d'abord bi-labiale.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

certaines positions se trouvait peut-être en collision avec l'adverbe *fort*). Qu'un nom de lieu comme *Finibus* > *Hinges* n'ait pas été rectifié, cela s'explique aisément; un cas comme *vapidu* > *fade* est moins clair[1]. Reste la question du *w* germanique. Celui-ci, tantôt aurait subi l'aspiration du *v* latin, pour passer à *f* et parfois jusqu'à *h*, tantôt, et le plus souvent, une aspiration spéciale qui le faisait passer de *ghw* à *g*. Qu'on ne s'étonne pas de ce double sort attribué au *w* germanique, car, de l'avis de tous, un flottement analogue existe pour le *v* latin; cf. entre autres le mot *vagina* > *gaîne*[2]. L'hypothèse que je viens d'énoncer paraîtra bien vague à côté des règles précises de Mr Nicholson; elle n'en a que plus de chances pour être vraie. Si en la réfutant on arrivait à jeter quelque lumière sur la langue de la Gaule, et qu'on parvînt ainsi à éclairer un peu mieux la période la plus obscure de son histoire, celui qui écrit ces lignes serait le premier à s'en réjouir.

JOHN ORR.

MANCHESTER.

[1] On aurait ainsi, dans la Gaule, un triple traitement du *v* latin: tantôt il serait conservé, tantôt il aurait subi le sort des emprunts latins en vieil-irlandais et serait devenu *f*, pour aboutir quelquefois à *h*, tantôt, comme dans le celtique du pays de Galles, il serait devenu *gw*; cf. le cymr. *gwin* et *gwers* à côté du v.-irl. *fin* et *fers*: latin *vinum*, *versus*. Serait-ce là une vague lueur projetée sur l'obscurité profonde de la dialectologie gauloise?

[2] On explique la consonne initiale de la série *gué*, *gâter*, etc. par l'influence de synonymes germaniques. Cette explication est peut-être exacte pour la plupart des mots en question, mais elle n'est bonne ni pour *gui* ni pour *gaine*. Or, je fais remarquer que l'irrégularité de ce dernier s'explique plus aisément si on suppose qu'à un moment donné *vagina* se rencontrait avec *fagina*, mot qui a donné *faîne*. L'explication 'germanique' est également peu satisfaisante dans le cas des parfaits provençaux du type *agron* > *habuerunt*, et des noms de lieu comme *Vapincum* > *Gap* et *Vertempa* > *Gartempe*.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

DANTE NOTES.

I.

Two Questionable Readings in the Florentine 'Testo Critico.'

A.

'Convivio,' ii. 6, l. 14.

In the sixth chapter of the second book of the *Convivio*, according to the text as printed in all the editions for the last hundred years, Dante speaks of Christ as 'figliuolo del sovrano Iddio e figliuolo di Maria Vergine (femmina veramente, e figlia di Giovacchino e d' Anna), uomo vero, il quale fu morto da noi.' For *Anna* in this passage the great majority of the MSS., and all five of the earliest printed editions (namely, the Florentine of 1490 and 1723, and the Venetian of 1521, 1529, and 1531), read *Adamo*, thus making Dante describe the Virgin Mary as 'the daughter of Joachim and of Adam'!—a pointless and inept description, for which it is incredible that Dante can have been responsible[1].

It is not difficult to see how the blunder arose. An early copyist, failing to realise that the words 'uomo vero' referred to 'Cristo' at the beginning of the sentence, took them to refer to the name immediately preceding them, which being that of a woman, 'Anna,' he corrected it to 'Adamo,' thus giving rise to the reading, as punctuated in all the earliest editions, 'Cristo, figliuolo del sovrano Iddio, e figliuolo di Maria Vergine, femmina veramente, e figlia di Giovacchino, e d'Adamo uomo veramente[2]: il quale fu morto da noi.' The correction 'Anna' for 'Adamo' was first made in the Milan edition of 1826, where (p. 90, n. 2) MS. authority is quoted for it, and where reference is made to Vincenzo Monti's *Saggio dei molti e gravi errori trascorsi in tutte le edizioni del* Convito *di Dante*, published at Milan three years before. Monti, who was one of the editors of the Milanese edition, after stating (p. 118) that the correction was due to Mazzucchelli, remarks, 'Al vedere Santa Anna cangiata in Adamo, e Maria Vergine figlia non già di maschio e di femmina, ma di due maschi vissuti in distanza di più che quattro mila

[1] It will be remembered that Dante mentions Anna as the mother of the Virgin in *Paradiso*, xxxii, 133–4.

[2] For *veramente* the Florentine ed. of 1723 reads *vero*.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

anni l' uno dall' altro, chi può tenersi dal ridere? E codici e stampe che sfacciatamente ci vendono così bestiali spropositi meritano essi la nostra fede?'

The Milanese editors, whose correction up till now has been accepted without question, made the meaning more obvious by printing the words 'femmina veramente e figlia di Giovacchino e d' Anna' in brackets—an example which has been followed by every succeeding editor. Now once more, presumably out of deference to the MS. tradition, the reading 'Adamo' has been introduced into the text, and that by two of the editors of the *Testo Critico*! Whether this 'bestiale sproposito,' as Monti terms it, will also find its way into the text of the 'edizione nazionale,' which is to be the definitive text, remains to be seen.

B.

'De Monarchia,' ii, 3, ll. 28–124.

In the third chapter of the second book of the *De Monarchia* Dante insists on the nobility of 'the most glorious king Aeneas, the father of the Roman people,' not only in respect of his own inherent virtue, but also in respect of his acquired nobility through his ancestors and his wives.

With regard to the acquired nobility of Aeneas, Dante claims that he was noble, both by descent and by marriage, in respect of all three continents ('quaelibet pars tripartiti orbis tam avis quam conjugibus illum nobilitasse invenitur'),—of Asia, by descent from Assaracus and by marriage with Creusa;—of Europe, by descent from Dardanus and by marriage with Lavinia;—of Africa, by descent from Electra and by marriage with Dido; and he concludes by asking (according to the hitherto universally accepted text):

> His itaque ad evidentiam subassumptae praenotatis, cui non satis persuasum est Romani populi patrem, et per consequens ipsum populum, nobilissimum fuisse sub coelo? Aut quem in illo duplici concursu sanguinis a qualibet mundi parte in unum virum praedestinatio divina latebit?

In the Florentine *Testo Critico*, however, Professor Rostagno, who was responsible for the text of the *De Monarchia*, prints in the last sentence, not 'in illo *duplici* concursu sanguinis,' but 'in illo *triplici* concursu'—a reading for which I can find no authority or support whatever, either in the MSS. or in the printed editions.

The meaning of 'duplex concursus sanguinis' is quite plain—it refers, of course, to the ennoblement of the blood of Aeneas and his progeny both by descent and marriage. Professor Rostagno is persuaded apparently that Dante intended to emphasise the confluence of blood

Digitized by Google Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

not from this double source, but from the three several continents ('quaelibet pars tripartiti orbis'), and he has altered the text accordingly *sub silentio* to fit this misconception. So far as I am aware, the only other text besides his which reads *triplici* is that of Dr Natale Vianello, which was published at Genoa later in the same year (1921). Dr Vianello, however, avowedly made use of Professor Rostagno's text, though, as he explains in a prefatory note, it only came into his hands at the last minute, which no doubt accounts for the fact that, while he substituted *triplici* for *duplici* in the text, he has left *duplice* ('quel duplice afflusso di nobile sangue') in his translation.

It is to be hoped that Professor Rostagno will reconsider the question, and will restore *duplici* to the text in the 'edizione nazionale.'

II.

'De Vulgari Eloquentia,' i, 14, ll. 20–5.

This passage is of special interest for two reasons. In the first place, it presents a textual problem which has so far only been solved tentatively. In the second place, there is considerable difference of opinion as to Dante's meaning.

The textual problem, of which I only became aware in the course of my revision of the text of the treatise for the new edition of the Oxford Dante, occurs in l. 25, at the very end of the passage—it concerns in fact the last word. In the Oxford Dante and in all previous printed texts this word is *facit*. But *facit* has no MS. authority. In the only two MSS. of the *De Vulgari Eloquentia* of independent value which were known when these texts were published the verb at the end of the sentence is by some accident omitted altogether. A similar instance occurs in the text of the *De Monarchia*, in the first chapter of the first book (l. 20), where the verb after 'Nam quem fructum...' is omitted in all the known MSS.[1], more than thirty in number. The missing verb in the *De Vulgari Eloquentia* was first supplied by Trissino in his Italian translation published in 1529—the earliest form in which the treatise appeared in print. He inserted *fa*—'ma ancora fa dubitare.' This lead was followed by Corbinelli, the editor of the *editio princeps* of the Latin text printed at Paris in 1577, who inserted *facit*. In a note on the passage in his *editio major* Professor Rajna states that he had thought of substituting *cogit* for *facit*, but on consideration had rejected

[1] This statement, which was made on the authority of Witte, and of the preface to the Florentine *Testo Critico* (p. xviii), requires qualification, for I find that in a Cent. xv MS. in the British Museum (*MS. Add.* 28804) the verb *ferret* has been inserted in the text—evidently a correction by a late copyist.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

it as being too strong a word. Consequently he retained *facit* also in his *editio minor*. He has since, however, changed his mind, for what reason we have yet to learn, for in the Florentine *Testo Critico* he reads *cogit*.

I was led to question the reading *facit* or *cogit* by considerations of the *cursus*. In going through the text carefully for the purpose of revision I was struck by the fact that, where the nature of the subject allows, the *cursus* is consistently observed throughout the treatise, a matter which I have dealt with in detail elsewhere[1].

In the present chapter there are sixteen recognised *cursus* endings in the first twenty-four lines, and then in line 25, at the end of .the period, where if anywhere we should expect the *cursus* to be observed, we are confronted, if *facit* or *cogit* be read, with a violation of the *cursus*! In order to satisfy the requirements of the *cursus* what is wanted is either a paroxytone trisyllable, or a proparoxytone tetrasyllable, which, in combination with *dubitáre*, would give in the one case a *planus*, in the other a *tardus*[2].

It was one of the disappointments of the newly-discovered MS. of the *De Vulgari Eloquentia*, the so-called Bini MS. (or the Berlin MS., as I prefer to call it, from the place of its discovery), the text of which was published in 1917 by Dr Bertalot, and of which I possess a photographic reproduction, that it does not supply the required verb in this passage. It does, however, supply evidence that there has been some corruption in the text, and that the loss of the verb is not due merely to scribal carelessness, for it gives the strange and meaningless reading *dubitare doctor*. It was no doubt the impossibility of making any sense of this combination which led to the omission of *doctor* by the scribes of the two later MSS. Dr Bertalot gives the reading of the MS. in his *apparatus criticus*, and in his text reads *docet*, which is as unsatisfactory as *facit* or *cogit* from the point of view of the *cursus*, while it is certainly not an improvement on either so far as the meaning is concerned.

Having failed myself to hit on a substitute which would satisfy the *cursus*, and at the same time account in some measure for the *doctor* of the Berlin MS., I submitted the problem and the data to Dr Mackail among others, and he, by a happy inspiration, suggested *auctorat*. This word meets the three requirements—it satisfies the *cursus*, giving: (dubi)táre auctórat (*planus*); it gives an eminently satisfactory meaning:

[1] See my paper on 'The Bearing of the *Cursus* on the Text of Dante's *De Vulgari Eloquentia*,' communicated to the British Academy on March 14, 1923, and published in Vol. XI of the *Proceedings* of the Academy.

[2] For the explanation of these and other terms used in connexion with the *cursus*, the reader is referred to the paper above mentioned.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

'authorises' or 'warrants the doubt'; and it plausibly accounts for the meaningless *doctor*, which might easily have arisen out of a blotted or mutilated *auctorat* in the MS. which the copyist had before him. Further, as I have pointed out elsewhere[1], the verb *auctoro* must certainly have been known to Dante, for it occurs in the *Magnae Derivationes* of Uguccione da Pisa, the Latin dictionary habitually used by Dante, in the first article, the very article from which he quotes in the sixth chapter of the fourth book of the *Convivio*, in the discussion (in lines 38 ff.) as to the derivation of the word *autore*[2]. I have accordingly substituted *auctorat* for *facit* in the revised text in the Oxford Dante, with the footnote: MS. *doctor*.

We come now to the question as to what exactly was Dante's meaning in this passage. He says at the beginning of the chapter that he found two vernaculars in Italy with opposite characteristics. The one was so soft that a man speaking it, with ever so manly a voice, was apt to be mistaken for a woman; while the other was so rugged that, on account of its harshness, 'mulierem loquentem non solum disterminat, sed esse virum dubitare [facit]' (to retain the hitherto accepted reading). In the first place there is a difference of opinion as to the meaning of 'disterminat' in line 24. Trissino renders it by 'disconcia'—'non solamente disconcia una donna che parli,' which Mr Ferrers Howell translates: 'not only distorts a woman's speech.' But I can find no authority for Trissino's interpretation of the word, and no other instance of it. The original sense seems to have been 'to separate,' 'divide,' and hence 'to exclude,' 'put beyond the pale'; so that the meaning of the phrase here would seem to be: 'puts out of court the idea that it is a woman speaking.' Professor Pio Rajna whom I consulted, and who kindly sent me his translation of the passage, renders: 'non solo toglie dal suo sesso la donna che parli,' that is, unsexes the woman who speaks it.

In the second place, what is the meaning of 'sed esse virum dubitare [facit]'? Trissino's rendering is: 'non solamente disconcia una donna che parli, ma ancora fa dubitare s' ella è uomo,' that is, to adopt Mr Ferrers Howell's interpretation, 'but makes one doubt whether she is not a man.' Professor Rajna, however, thinks that Dante by *virum* here meant not man as opposed to woman, but man as opposed to brute beast. He renders: 'ma fa dubitare se sia neppur uomo,' that is to say, 'but makes one doubt whether it is even a man speaking,' in other words,

[1] See the above-mentioned paper, p. 9, n.
[2] See my *Dante Studies and Researches*, pp. 101 ff.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

whether it is not the voice of an animal; though in that case, as Professor Rajna admits, we should have expected Dante to write not *virum*, but *hominem*. He informs me, however, that he has more than once changed his mind as to the meaning of the passage, and has not yet finally satisfied himself as to the correct interpretation; so that the above rendering must be regarded as provisional.

My own view is that Dante intended to convey that the two vernaculars were the exact converse of each other, the one being so soft that you would take a man speaking it for a woman; the other so harsh that you would take a woman speaking it for a man. I should accordingly translate lines 20–25 (reading *auctorat* in line 25) as follows:

> But there is another vernacular, as we have said, which is so rough and rugged in its vocabulary and accent that its untempered harshness in the mouth of a woman not only excludes the idea that it is a woman speaking, but warrants the doubt whether it is not a man.

It may be objected to this rendering that it involves what practically amounts to a tautology, for if it is not a woman, what else can it be but a man (a child obviously being excluded)?—but unless we admit *virum* to be used in the sense of *hominem*, as suggested by Professor Rajna, a solution which does not commend itself to me, this seems to be inevitable, and the fault must be laid at Dante's door.

III.

'Inferno,' xiv, 13–15.

At the beginning of the fourteenth canto of the *Inferno* Dante compares the waste of burning sand in Round 3 of the seventh Circle to the Libyan desert 'which was of old trodden by the feet of Cato':

> Lo spazzo era un' arena arida e spessa,
> Non d' altra foggia fatta che colei,
> Che fu da' piè di Caton già soppressa.

Dr Moore and the commentators refer in a general way to Lucan's account of Cato's expedition through the desert of Libya in the ninth book of the *Pharsalia* (vv. 371 ff.); but the only one of them, so far as I am aware, to notice the special point in the phrase, 'da' piè di Caton soppressa,' is the sixteenth century commentator Lodovico Castelvetro, who lays stress on the fact, particularly noted by Lucan, whom he quotes, that Cato did not take his ease lying in a litter, or seated in a chariot, but marched on foot at the head of his troops:

> Praecedit anheli
> Militis ora pedes, monstrat tolerare labores,
> Non iubet, et nulla vehitur cervice supinus
> Carpentove sedens. (ix, 587–90.)

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

This procedure on the part of Cato was in accordance with his speech to his men, as reported by Lucan earlier in this same book:

> Dum primus arenas
> Ingrediar primusque gradus in pulvere ponam,
> Me calor aetherius feriat, etc. (vv. 394 ff.)

IV.

Epistola, v, 122–5.

Professor Dino Bigongiari has been anticipated in his (partial) emendation of this passage (see *M.L.R.* xviii, 476–7), which in my text runs: 'Et si ex notioribus nobis innotiora; simpliciter interest humanae apprehensioni, ut per motum coeli motorem intelligamus et eius velle.' In an article published in the *Civiltà Cattolica* for July 16, 1921, Padre G. Busnelli proposed to emend the passage as follows: 'Et si ex notioribus nobis in notiora simpliciter iter est humanae apprehensioni, etc.'; and he compared (as I had done in my note) the parallel passage in lines 19–23 of § 20 of the *Quaestio*: 'Quum igitur innata sit nobis via investigandae veritatis circa naturalia ex notioribus nobis, naturae vero minus notis, in certiora naturae et notiora, ut patet ex primo *Physicorum*...'

The substitution of *iter est* (which is actually the reading of *S. Pantaleo* 8, one of the two MSS. in which this letter has been preserved) for *interest* is obviously right, *iter* (like *via* in the *Quaestio* passage) being the rendering of ἡ ὁδός in the original. I have consequently emended my text accordingly (with due acknowledgment to Padre Busnelli) in the forthcoming new edition of the Oxford Dante.

The *translatio antiqua* of the passage at the beginning of the first book of the *Physics* (which Dante also had in mind in *Convivio*, ii, 1, ll. 107–14) runs as follows:

> Innata autem est ex notioribus nobis via et certioribus, in certiora naturae et notiora. Non enim eadem nobis nota et simpliciter. Unde quidem necesse secundum modum hunc procedere ex incertioribus naturae, nobis autem certioribus, in certiora naturae et notiora.

I am indebted to Professor J. A. Stewart for pointing out that in this translation, as well as in the *Quaestio* passage, φύσει (or τῇ φύσει) γνωριμώτερα καὶ πρότερα (*sudpte naturâ notiora*) is rendered by *naturae* (dat.) *notiora*, 'better known *to Nature*,' as if φύσις, *Natura*, were personified as the knower. This is a blunder, he says, which seems to have been common in Latin versions, for Muretus in his notes on *Eth. Nic.* i, 4 (1602) goes out of his way to expose it. It occurs also in Argyropulus' version of the *Ethics*, and Bacon has it in *Nov. Org.* i,

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

22 : ' ea quae revera naturae sunt notiora.' Φύσει in *Eth.* i, 4, and *Phys.* i, 1, and similar passages, is exactly what it is in such connexions as φύσει δοῦλος, φύσει πολιτικὸν ζῶον.

It may be observed that this blunder does not occur in the *translatio recens* which accompanies the commentary of Aquinas; in that version of the *Physics* the passage runs:

> Naturaliter autem constituta est via ab iis quae sunt nobis notiora et clariora, ad ea quae sunt clariora et notiora natura ; non enim eadem sunt et nobis nota, et simpliciter : quare necesse est hoc modo progredi, nimirum ex iis quae natura quidem sunt obscuriora, nobis tamen sunt clariora, ad ea quae sunt notiora et clariora natura.

Professor Bigongiari in his note says ' the old translation of Aristotle reads: "et si ex notioribus nobis in notiora *naturâ*," ' which is rather puzzling—where do the words ' et si ' come from, and is *naturâ* his own correction *sub silentio* of the *naturae* of the text?

PAGET TOYNBEE.

FIVEWAYS, BURNHAM, BUCKS.
30 *Oct.* 1923.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

ITALIAN AND ENGLISH PASTORAL DRAMA OF THE RENAISSANCE.

SOURCE OF THE 'COMPLAINT OF THE SATYRES AGAINST THE NYMPHES.'

It is a recognised fact that the Elizabethan pastoral drama is wholly Italian in origin. The pastoral convention, a direct outcome of the renewed study of the classics, is already apparent in such early works as those of Boccaccio. This same convention dominated dramatic entertainments given in Italian courts during the first half of the sixteenth century, and later, when it had attained a more mature form of expression, was eagerly welcomed, studied and reproduced by Elizabethan playwrights.

It is impossible that such an exchange of ideas should have taken place without direct and unbroken contact between the cultured men of the two countries. The depth, force and constancy of that contact have so far been overlooked. The very obviousness of the main source of inspiration in the English pastoral drama has led critics into a strangely disproportioned view of the subject. They have concentrated almost entirely on the rarer instances of originality of treatment and on the particular method of adapting the convention to English soil. In this way the assiduous contact between the two countries, the vast knowledge of the English playwrights who studied and reproduced so consciously and so faithfully the Italian originals, have been overlooked as being unworthy or unneedful of exposition.

Moreover the severe standards of literary excellence, which are characteristic of Italy, have made it inevitable that a whole mass of secondary plays should be buried in oblivion—and, to any but the patient investigator, a mere handful of the masterpieces should alone have survived to represent the type. A careful study of these minor pastoral plays will serve to build up sure evidence of the direct relation between the two literatures, and also to throw a distinct light upon the debt of England to Italy. These minor plays, though devoid of intrinsic merit in their monotonous similarity of style and plot, did undoubtedly play their part in building up, strengthening and diffusing the pastoral convention in Italy and abroad. The fact that they have been overlooked has led English critics into grave errors concerning the history of the pastoral drama in England. The very excellence of the *Aminta* and the *Pastor*

Digitized by Google

Original from
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Fido and their wide-spread renown have given rise to the belief that, if no trace of their influence is to be found in English plays of the same type, then these owe nothing to the Italian pastoral convention, but are entirely original productions. The theory brought forward by A. H. Thorndike[1] and by R. Warwick Bond[2], that the pastoral drama developed in England on entirely independent and original lines, though parallel to the Italian, will be seen to be untenable since it is based upon the assumption that the *Aminta* and the *Pastor Fido* were the only Italian pastorals known to Elizabethan playwrights. It can be proved, on the contrary, that almost all the sporadic attempts between 1572 and 1605 to dramatise pastoral material can be traced to definite Italian sources. These critics do not in reality ascertain how far the early pastoral drama is original and how far it is influenced by the earlier and already more mature pastoral convention of Italy.

This theory of the existence of a native pre-Italian pastoral tradition in England is also shared by W. W. Greg[3], but the idea is again founded, as he himself declares, upon the 'absence of any evidence of direct imitation[4].' In his masterly study of the pastoral, he does in fact stop short at an important point. Although tracing the gradual development of the Italian pastoral drama (*v.* Appendix) he fails to ascertain exactly which plays were known to the English playwrights. It is by rectifying this omission that the evidence he lacks can be supplied.

Among the many instances of direct imitation which await patient research, can be found a dainty poem, the *Complaint of the Satyres against the Nymphes*, which was included in the 'Entertainment at Harefield' given before Queen Elizabeth in July or August 1602. The poem was published for the first time by John Nichols in his *Progresses of Queen Elizabeth*, 1788–1821 (Vol. IV, part 1, p. 17), as forming part of a copy of 'some papers belonging to the late Sir Roger Newdigate, Baronet' (17 pages folio), lettered on the back by a later hand 'Entertainment of Queen Elizabeth at Harefield by Countesse of Derby.'

The poem runs as follows·

The Complaint of the Satyres against the Nymphes.

Tell me, O Nymphes, why do you
Shune us that do your loves pursue?
What doe the Satyres notes retaine
That should merite your disdaine?

[1] *Pastoral Element in English Drama before* 1605, *Mod. Lang. Notes*, Vol. XIV, No. 4, p. 228.
[2] *Notes on Italian Influence in Lyly's Plays*, *Works of John Lyly*, Vol. II, p. 474.
[3] *Pastoral Poetry and Pastoral Drama*, 1906, p. 446.
[4] *Op. cit.*, p. 216.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

On our browes if hornes do growe
Was not Bacchus armed soe?
Yet of him the Candean maid
Held no scorne, nor was affraid.
Say our colours tawny bee
Phoebus was not fair to see;
Yet faire Clymen did not shunn
To be Mother of his Sonne.
If our beards be rough and long
Soe had Hercules the strong;
Yet Deianier, with many a kisse
Join'd her tender lipps to his.
If our bodies hayry bee,
Mars as rugged was as wee:
Yet did Ilia think her grac'd
For to be by Mars imbraced.
Say our feet ill-favored are
Cripples leggs are worse by farre:
Yet faire Venus during life,
Was the lymping Vulcan's wife.
Breefly, if by nature we
But imperfect creatures be;
Think not our defects so much
Since Celestial Powers be such.
But you Nymphs, whose veniall love
Love of gold alone doth move,
Though you scorne us, yet for gold
Your base love is bought and sold.

This complaint has so far been regarded as an original composition, and as such it was published in 1902 by R. Warwick Bond in his *Works of John Lyly* (Vol. I, p. 491). He attributes it to Lyly, but fails to recognise its source. Whether or no Lyly be the author of the poem, its actual origin can be established. It is none other than a free rendering of a passage taken from G. B. Giraldi Cinthio's *Egle* (1545), a play in blank verse which aimed at reviving the ancient satyric drama. Egle, the beloved of Sileno, is the central figure of the play. When, however, she attempts to persuade her fellow-nymphs to yield to the love of the satyrs, they pour scorn on her pleading (*Egle*, III, 1):

Driadi: Che noi amiam quelle bestiacce sozze
De' quai cosa non ha il mondo più brutta?

Whereupon Egle makes the following defence of the despised satyrs:

Egle: In lor parte non è da capo a piedi
Che non sen possa haver dal ciel l' essempio.
Hanno le corna, e le corna have Bacco[1],
E nondimen non lo sprezzò Ariadna,
Focosa hanno la faccia, e la faccia have[2]
Phebo di foco, e pur Climene l' ama:
Et se son terribili nel viso,
Terribile è Nettuno, e nondimeno

[1] 'On our browes if hornes do growe...affraid.'
[2] 'Say our colours tawny bee...Sonne.'

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Thetide l' ama più che sè medesma;
S' han rigida la barba, l' have tale[1]
Hercole, e mai Deianira sua
Non si sdegnò darli amorosi basci,
S' hanno il corpo irto, e irto ha' l corpo Marte[2],
Nè Ilia fuggì giamai perchè foss' irto;
Se vi spiaccion, perc' hanno i piè caprigni[3],
Et chi è piu sozzo d' uno torto, e zoppo,
E tutto nero e affumicato? e 'n cielo
Venere ama Vulcan, quantunque tale,
Et ella la Dea sia d' ogni bellezza,
Però gran torto havete a non far stima[4]
Di questi Dei che voi chiamate sozzi.

Beyond putting the defence into the mouth of the satyrs themselves the English poet has changed nothing. He has, however, rounded off the poem with an additional verse which is highly reminiscent of the speech of the Satyr in Tasso's *Aminta*, II, 1, 53, 70.

Satiro: Non son io brutto, no: nè tu mi sprezzi
Perchè sì fatto io sia, ma solamente
Perchè povero sono...
E veramente il secol d' oro è questo,
Poi che sol vince l' oro e regna l' oro.
O chiunque tu fosti, che insegnasti
Primo a vender l' amor, sia maledetto
Il tuo cener sepolto...Amor venale,
Amor servo de l' oro è il maggior mostro,
Ed il più abbominevole e il più sozzo
Che produca la terra o 'l mar fra l' onde[5].

It must be admitted that the *Complaint* is, in almost every detail, identical with the passage from *Egle*, but nothing could be more unlike the original Italian as far as the metre is concerned. Giraldi Cinthio writing his play in 1545 uses the 'endecasillabo sciolto' which was by that time already popular with Italian dramatists, whereas, at the same date in England, Surrey alone was tentatively experimenting with the corresponding form of blank verse.

It is obvious that the English poet had this passage of *Egle* before him, and that he has woven it into a delightfully flowing and graceful poem which in its form has much in common with the spontaneous English lyric of the time. So completely indeed does the dainty lyric spirit prevail, that, far from recalling the original Italian, it carries the

[1] 'If our beards...his.'
[2] 'If our bodies...imbraced.'
[3] 'Say our feet...wife.'
[4] 'Breefly, if by nature...such.'
[5] Cf. 'But you Nymphs, whose veniall love
Love of gold alone doth move,
Though you scorne us, yet for gold
Your base love is bought and sold.'

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

mind forward to the antics of the satyrs of Ben Jonson's masque *Oberon the Fairy Prince.*

4th Satyr: Will he give us pretty toys
To beguile the girls withal?
3rd Satyr: And to make 'em quickly fall?...
1st Satyr: Ay and gild our cloven feet?
3rd Satyr: Strew our head with poulders sweet?
1st Satyr: Bind our crooked legs in hoops
Made of shells with silver loops?
2nd Satyr: Tie about our tawny wrists
Bracelets of the fairy twists?
4th Satyr: And to spight the coy nymphs scorns
Hang upon our stubbed horns,
Garlands, ribbands of fine posies....

The English poet has undoubtedly animated his *Complaint* with a dainty wistful quality which is all his own.

If, however, such an obvious rehandling of material derived from a well-known Italian play can have passed unnoticed until now, it is reasonable to suppose that much of the English pastoral drama yet remains to be traced to its original source. In fact, evidence can be brought forward of direct imitation not only at so late a date as the *Complaint*, but in the more important early stages.

In England the first trace of dramatisation of the pastoral convention appears, as in Italy, in a court entertainment. Moreover, it was definitely organised and presented by Italians. The Revels' Accounts record payments between Feb. and Nov. 1573 'for the Italyan Players that followed the progresse and made pastyme first at Wynsor and afterwards at Reading[1].' That the entertainment was of a pastoral character is clearly indicated by the list of properties, which includes:

A plank of ffyrr and other peeces of sawen wood.
Iron work for a frame for a seate.
Golde lether for cronets.
Thred and sheperde hookes.
Lamskynnes for Shepperds.
Horstayles for the wylde mannes garment.
Arrowes for nymphes.
Lights and shepperds staves.
Hoops for garlands.
Baye leaves and flowers.
The hyer of a syth for Saturne.
The hier of a Trunk.

That Italian actors attached to Elizabeth's court produced, in the same year that the *Aminta* was played in Ferrara, a performance that included shepherds, nymphs, a wild man and Saturn, goes far to prove that the way was already being paved for the Italian pastoral drama itself in England.

[1] Cunningham, *Revels*, p. 77; A. Feuillerat, *Revels*, p. 225.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

There is no indication to be found as to whether these actors played in English or in Italian, though the latter is more probable, for Elizabeth was a keen Italian scholar. A rueful letter of the Ambassador of the Duke of Wurtemberg testifies to this, for he writes in 1595 of being 'obliged to deliver standing his address in Italian, which was the Queens favorite language.' Again, the Revels' Accounts[1] record payments in 1572 to one Petrucio for 'preparacion of a mask' and in 1578 'to Patruchius Ubaldinas by the commandment of the Lord Chamberlyne for the translating of certen speaches into Italian to be used in the maske: the making of tables for them, the writing faire in the same tables, and for his chardges in travelling about the same. xlij^{s} ij^{d}.' How far it was the custom of the court to perform masques containing speeches in Italian, or perhaps to introduce into Italian plays passages specially arranged to suit the circumstances or, another alternative, to bring in allusions proper to the Elizabethan court, passages written in English and requiring translation, cannot be said, but the very fact that Petruccio Ubaldino, a Florentine, was in receipt of a yearly fee of 40 marks from the Queen points to the probability of something of the kind being the case. Even more light would be thrown on the matter, if the identity of the Italian players could be established, especially in view of the fact that a troop is known to have been in Paris in 1570, called there by Catherine de' Medici. She it was who in 1576 summoned to Paris the company known as the 'Comici gelosi,' then headed by Drusiano Martinelli[2]. There is every reason to believe that this company can be identified with that of the 'comediante Drousiano' mentioned by Collier[3] as being in London in 1578. Collier gives no record of the source of his information, but an 'order was issued by the Privy Council on Dec. 13, 1578, in which permission was given to Dronsiano (sic) and his companions to act "within the Cittie and the liberties of the same" until the first week of Lent[4].' If this 'Drousiano' is indeed Drusiano Martinelli, then it must be remembered that he would bring with him to Elizabeth's court great fame, as being the head of the very company, the 'Comici gelosi,' who on July 31, 1573, after careful training by Torquato Tasso himself, played the *Aminta* for the first time before Alfonso II at Belvedere near Ferrara.

In spite of the lack of further details of their performances, the very

[1] Feuillerat, p. 160; Cunningham, p. 140.
[2] See Armand Baschet, *Les comédiens italiens à la cour de France*, 1842, p. 41, and N. M. Bernardin, *La comédie italienne en France*, 1570–1791, Paris, 1902.
[3] *History Eng. Dram. Poetry*, I, p. 235, III, p. 398.
[4] See Creizenach, *English Drama*, VI, p. 296.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

presence of these Italian players in England at this time is significant, for it was but a few years later that the court of Elizabeth witnessed Peele's *Arraignment of Paris*, the earliest play that has come down to us bearing the title of 'pastoral.' In connection with this play, Dr Greg points out: 'It is a striking fact and one which serves to indicate a real parallelism in the evolution of the tradition in the two countries that, in England as in Italy, the way was paved for the pastoral by the appearance of mythological plays introducing incidentally pastoral scenes and characters, and anticipating to some extent at any rate the peculiar atmosphere of the Arcadian drama.' He finds the germ of the Italian pastoral in Poliziano's *Orfeo* (1471), while Tasso's *Aminta* (1573) represents the mature form: in England the parallel line of development begins with Peele's *Arraignment of Paris* (1584), and the type reaches maturity in Fletcher's *Faithful Shepherdess* (1608). Dr Greg ignores the fact that a whole century elapsed between the appearance of the *Orfeo* and that of the *Aminta*, and that during that time hundreds of minor pastorals were produced. Is it possible that, in an age in which Italian culture was paramount, the same process of evolution could be accomplished in England in the comparatively short space of twenty-five years, without being influenced by the older Italian tradition?

Moreover, if it could be proved that Peele's *Arraignment of Paris* is, in reality, modelled upon an earlier Italian play of the mythological pastoral type, would not this evidence of direct imitation in the early stages deal a final blow to the theory of a separate parallel development in England? Such proof can be brought forward and is reserved for separate treatment in a future article.

V. M. JEFFERY.

LONDON.

Digitized by Google

Original from
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

THE PERSECUTION OF THE YOUNG GERMANS.

I.

WHEN in 1835 first Prussia and then the Federal Diet issued Edicts condemning to perpetual oblivion the past, present and future writings of the Young Germans, Heine, Gutzkow, Laube, Mundt and Wienbarg the reading public naturally rushed to the libraries and the booksellers and paid large sums to secure the works of such extremely dangerous authors. They must have felt more than a little cheated when they sat down to read them. The *Romantische Schule* and *Salon II*, although instinct with the Saint-Simonian criticism of Christianity and voicing a passionate appeal for the rights of the flesh, were, for all the wit and poetry which Heine had lavished on them, not exactly calculated to satisfy the desires of the sensationalist. Wienbarg's *Aesthetische Feldzüge*, elaborating Heine's theories into an aesthetic code, must have been a most painful disappointment, and although in Mundt's *Madonna* and Laube's *Poeten* long and tedious arguments were interspersed with scenes of questionable morality and doubtful taste, still even these erotic descriptions were not in themselves enough to account for the unprecedented severity of the government interference. One imagines the baffled but determined sensation-hunter turning to *Wally die Zweiflerin*, sure that here at least he will get the thrill of outraged horror, which the Edicts had seemed to promise. For had not Menzel written article after article in the *Literaturblatt zum Morgenblatt* against this one novel alone, abusing it in the most violent language, scattering coarse and ugly epithets, raving about blasphemy and immorality in terms which lacked all decent restraint? A book which could produce this state of mind in a seasoned critic, the literary lawgiver of Germany, must be something really unusual. Unusually dull, so ran, one supposes, the final, embittered verdict. Wooden characters, stilted dialogue, onc innocently clumsy attempt at a daring scene, long and uninteresting religious speculations, a *réchauffé* of the *Wolfenbüttler Fragmente* and Strauss' *Life of Christ*; what on earth does Menzel mean, and what is the government about?

What Menzel meant was mischief, and the not too obscure motives

Digitized by Google

Original from
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

which prompted him, partly personal enmity, partly professional jealousy, partly, no doubt, respectable but not very enlightened principles and prejudices, do not at this date call for a very solemn investigation. The attitude of the Prussian and Austrian governments, however, and of the German press as a whole, shows some features of special interest and is worth a more serious consideration.

II.

Acting on the reports of the 'Obercensurcollegium,' Prussia had since 1833 forbidden the sale of the works of these five authors one by one. It was a gesture which had become almost automatic. The fact that they all adopted a critical attitude towards Christianity, the state and the marriage laws was reason enough for the gruff 'Verboten' with which each pawn was swept from the board. The Young Germans did not, however, suffer quite as much under these prohibitions as one might expect. The 'Obercensurcollegium' was a slow-moving body; the reports were generally dated a month or two after the publication of the book in question, the law a day or two later, and the application of the law was far from easy. A bold and enterprising publisher like Campe could and did evade it; it was a game well worth playing where Heine's books were concerned, and he played it with skill and success; other firms displayed a like ingenuity. Also, since the law applied only in Prussia and might or might not be adopted in other states, it is not unusual to find the literary journals reviewing books which the Prussian government had forbidden many months before.

On April 30, 1835, however, the 'Obercensurcollegium' took a long step forward by registering a very strong protest against the tendency of these writers in the report on Theodor Mundt's *Madonna*, a report which shows that the Prussian government had already arrived at a constructive attitude towards the Young Germans, and was contemplating stringent repressive measures.

Das Buch nimmt eine sehr bedeutende Stelle in einer Klasse von Schriften ein, die sich in den letzten Jahren so wie noch in keiner früheren Zeit der deutschen Literatur hervorgethan hat, und die im hohen Grade sittenverderblich und also mittelbar auch politisch gefährlich zu wirken droht. Es sind dies die Schriften, deren Grundgedanke auf Geltendmachung der zügellosesten sinnlichen Lust—nicht in der nackten Weise der französischen Materialisten und mancher deutschen Romanschreiber vom gewöhnlichen Schlage—sondern in engster Verbindung mit scheinbar tiefgeistigen, selbst religiösen Lehren und Gefühlen gerichtet ist und dergleichen mehrere, namentlich von dem berüchtigen Heine, von Heinrich Laube, von Wienbrack (*sic*) bereits zu dringend motivirten Verboten Anlass gegeben haben. *Wiedereinsetzung des Fleisches* in seine unverjährbaren Rechte, die es besonders durch das Christenthum (oder wie in dem in Rede stehenden Roman angedeutet wird, durch den Missverstand des Christenthums, der Lehre von dem Fleisch oder

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Welt gewordenen Gott) eingebüsst habe, ist ein von Schriftstellern dieser Schule des 'jungen Deutschlands' selbst consecrirter Ausdruck für den wesentlichen Zielpunkt ihres Strebens, ein Ausdruck, der auch hier vorkommt[1].

There are two omissions of importance in this report: Gutzkow's name is absent, although his edition of Schleiermacher's *Vertraute Briefe über die Lucinde* with the startling preface had appeared in March 1835 and been forbidden in Prussia in the month of April. Nor is there any recognition of the fact that the catchword, 'rehabilitation of the flesh,' was borrowed from the Saint-Simonians. Prussia appears to be ignorant of this connection, and not only Prussia, but the German press as a whole, which had followed the movements and discussed the theories of the Saint-Simonians with intense and angry interest during the years 1830–1834, and which now fell tooth and nail on the Young Germans, seems to have been equally blind to the very obvious relationship.

There is one outstanding exception, Hengstenberg of the *Evangelische Kirchenzeitung*. The part which this fierce and gifted theologian played in the press campaign against the Young Germans is of the utmost importance and has not been adequately recognised. In the eyes of posterity Menzel has borne the chief responsibility in a campaign which is by now indissolubly connected with Gutzkow's novel *Wally die Zweiflerin*, published on August 12, 1835; it was in fact initiated by Hengstenberg in the *Evangelische Kirchenzeitung* on August 8, and was directed mainly against Heine, and particularly against volume II of his *Salon*. By including Gutzkow's preface to Schleiermacher's letters among the works of the school[2], Hengstenberg showed himself to be more alert than the 'Obercensurcollegium,' and his clearer insight into the tendency of this group of writers did not end there. An earlier preoccupation with the Saint-Simonians, which had resulted in an interesting and well-informed article[3], gave him the key to the situation. He occupies a unique position among the contemporary detractors of the Young Germans in seeing clearly the origin of their theories; for he was thoroughly conversant with the second year of the *Doctrine de Saint-Simon*, and had no difficulty in drawing the obvious conclusion. Indeed he went too far. He assumed without further ado that the

[1] L. Geiger, *Das junge Deutschland und die preussische Censur*, Berlin, 1900, pp. 75–76. I adopt Draeger's reading of the last sentence, cf. O. Draeger, *Theodor Mundt und seine Beziehungen zum jungen Deutschland*, Marburg, 1909, p. 63, note 3.

[2] He reviewed as works of the 'Rehabilitatoren' (as he called them): Heine, *Salon II*, Gutzkow, *Vorrede*, Mundt, *Madonna*, Wienbarg, *Aesthetische Feldzüge* and *Charlotte Stieglitz, ein Denkmal* by Mundt, but published anonymously. He also included Laube in the school.

[3] *Evangelische Kirchenzeitung*, Berlin, March 23, 1831.

Digitized by Google Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Young Germans were Saint-Simonians, and latter-day Saint-Simonians at that, whereas the case was in reality much more complicated. Hengstenberg, however, was far too startled at finding the hated New Religion lifting up its head in the fatherland to waste time over subtle differences and distinctions. He tied all the Young Germans together, thrust them into a neatly-labelled pigeon-hole and left them there, regardless of the fact that the pigeon-hole was too large for one, too narrow for another, and that the label did not apply to a third. Yet, to change the metaphor, the cap fitted as well as any cap can be expected to fit five different heads. Truth may sometimes lurk in a sweeping statement, and Hengstenberg, in establishing too close a connection between Saint-Simonism and Young Germany, was much nearer the truth than his contemporaries, who saw no connection at all[1].

Clear-sighted as this writer was about the main tendency of the school, it is not surprising to find that he saw in Heine the villain of the piece, and that he gave him all the prominence which Heine deserved, but which later became somewhat obscured by the blinding limelight which Menzel's articles threw on the figure of Gutzkow[2]. For between the publication of Hengstenberg's first article on August 8 and 12, 1835, and the second on October 17, 21 and 24, Menzel had opened his attack on *Wally* in the *Literaturblatt zum Morgenblatt* on September 11. The hunt was up, and when it came to the kill, it would be a long-sighted onlooker indeed who could apportion the chief share to any particular member of the pack in tearing the quarry limb from limb. That Menzel bayed the loudest it would be idle to deny, but it was Hengstenberg who first gave tongue.

III.

Until some months after the publication of *Wally* on August 12, 1835, the Prussian prohibitions of the Young German writings and the campaign against them by the press went on side by side, and seemed

[1] Menzel made one vague reference to Saint-Simonism in this connection during the year 1835 (*Lit. Bl.*, Oct. 26). None of the other papers even refer to the subject, although they had all been interested in Saint-Simonism during the years 1830–1834.

[2] During the year 1835 Menzel concentrated his attention on Gutzkow and Wienbarg, the editors of the *Deutsche Revue*. He accused Gutzkow on one occasion of trying to lure the young people to his side by the 'Parole Heine' (Sept. 14), and on another he speaks of the trivolity of 'Heine und seine Schule' (Oct. 23), but it was not until 1836 that he gave Heine a place among the Young Germans and declared that the whole movement was due to him (Jan. 4). Laube came in for a thrust in the same number under a transparent veil of anonymity, the only mention Menzel ever made of this author. On March 23 and 25, 1836, Menzel at length reviewed *Salon II*. Curiously enough, *Zur Geschichte der neueren schönen Literatur in Deutschland* had escaped notice in the earlier numbers of the review, which otherwise kept an interested and fairly indulgent eye on Heine. Throughout the Young German fracas, Mundt enjoyed the protection of Menzel's silence.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

like two parallel lines, destined never to meet. The press made no reference to the government prohibitions, and that the 'Obercensurcollegium' proceeded independently of the press is clear, since, with one startling exception, the literary reviews lagged sadly behind the government reports. The one exception is the report on *Wally* which is dated September 18, 1835, almost a week after Menzel's first article on this novel. Yet the lack of contact between the 'Obercensurcollegium' and the reviews is nowhere more glaringly evident than in this report, which must have been drawn up in ignorance of Menzel's attack, for the connection between Gutzkow and the Young Germans is entirely ignored; as far as Prussia was concerned Gutzkow stood alone, and although his novel was emphatically condemned, and the author stigmatised as 'schon längst übel berüchtigt[1],' yet there is no hint that he was linked up in the minds of the court with that Young Germany against whose tendency they had protested in April 1835[2].

This brings us to another point. At the time of the report on *Madonna*, now five months old, the 'Obercensurcollegium' seemed to be meditating something unusual in the way of reprisals, yet special reprisals came there none, until the clamorous concert raised by Hengstenberg and Menzel (to name no lesser names) fell on a sharper pair of ears, and one mightier than Prussia was aroused. Austria in the person of Metternich now took a hand in the game, and the doom of the Young Germans was sealed.

The influence of Metternich was felt in two directions. In the first place, he undoubtedly galvanised Prussia into life[3]. It is possible that had it not been for his intervention the Prussian Edicts of November 14, 1835 would never have been composed, or at least might not have taken so severe a form[4]. Certain it is, that until Metternich's first letter to Wittgenstein on the subject, dated October 31, 1835, there is no hint that any such measures were being contemplated. The slow-moving northern state, however, now found itself, not for the first time, impelled onwards by a driving force which would not be gainsaid. I am far from implying that Prussia was unwilling to be driven. She

[1] Geiger, *op. cit.*, pp. 58–59, gives an extract of this report. H. Burckhardt in a denunciation of *Wally* (*Organ des deutschen Buchhandels*, Berlin, Sept. 5, 1835) speaks of Gutzkow as 'schon berüchtigt geworden.' This textual resemblance is significant, since Burckhardt appeals to the authorities to forbid *Wally*, and to close Löwenthal's firm.

[2] It will be remembered that Gutzkow's name was not included on this occasion.

[3] Cf. Houben, *Jungdeutscher Sturm und Drang*, Leipzig, 1911, pp. 59 ff.

[4] The text of these Edicts is given by Houben, pp. 43–44. They are directed against the past, present and future writings of Gutzkow, Laube, Mundt and Wienbarg. Löwenthal, the publisher, the *Deutsche Revue* and the *Literarischer Zodiacus* receive a special mention. An addendum of Dec. 11, 1835 included Heine under the same ban.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

was at this time as reactionary as even Austria could wish; her intentions were admirable, from Metternich's point of view, but her performance left much to be desired. The stage was set, the actors eager enough to play their parts, when he appeared among them, an experienced professional, to coach this troupe of amateurs. Von Mühler[1], Tzschoppe[2], Wittgenstein[3], Friedrich Wilhelm III[4], they all now began to act with real conviction, and it was owing to Metternich that the first night was such an unqualified success; the play indeed proved so popular, that it toured the provinces and met with an enthusiastic reception[5].

But if Metternich's hand is clearly discernible in the Prussian Edicts, the part he played in bringing the Federal Edicts into being is still more remarkable, and there can be no manner of doubt that they owed their inception to him. The only contribution of the Federal Diet as a whole was to alter the form from an express prohibition to a solemnly-worded threat. Münch-Bellinghausen, Austrian ambassador to the Diet, opened the campaign under Metternich's directions on October 29, by advising his colleagues to concerted action against the young literature. Ironically enough, it was Prussia who furnished the ostensible occasion for this advice, by the report of the Prussian ambassador, von Schöler, of the prohibition of Wienbarg's *Wanderungen durch den Thierkreis* in Prussia. This is entirely typical of the respective modes of action of Austria and Prussia, and it is difficult not to suppose that, had she been left to herself, Prussia would have gone quietly and contentedly on, forbidding one book after another.

[1] Minister of Justice. He replaced von Rochow, Minister of the Interior and of Police, during his absence on sick-leave, and signed the November Edicts. What is more, the clause forbidding the future works of the Young Germans is in his handwriting. Houben first made it clear that von Rochow was not responsible for these Edicts. On Feb. 16, 1836, he and Ancillon, Minister for Foreign Affairs, published an emendation, removing the clause which applied to the future works of the Young Germans, much to the wrath of Metternich and of Friedrich Wilhelm III.

[2] Member of the secret Ministerialcommission and of the Obercensurcollegium, Councillor to the Ministry and to the royal family. He was Wittgenstein's right-hand man, and was notorious for his persecution of the Young Germans. The November Edicts are in his handwriting, with the exception of the last clause. It is perhaps not unimportant to add that he suffered under the persecution mania and died insane.

[3] Hausminister, member of the secret Ministerialcommission, and Chief of the Political Police. He was a power in the royal palace, and was favoured with Metternich's correspondence, which he passed on to the king.

[4] That Friedrich Wilhelm III was as much an enemy of the Young German movement as even Metternich could wish is proved by the very sharp tone of the cabinet order addressed to von Rochow and to Ancillon on April 7, 1836, rebuking them for the amendment to the November Edicts. (Houben, *op. cit.*, p. 51.)

The part which these various persons played in the November Edicts has been closely examined and clearly set forth by Houben, *op. cit.*, pp. 42–61.

[5] Baden on Nov. 24, Braunschweig on Dec. 5, Gotha on Dec. 9, Hessen on Dec. 12, and Bavaria on Dec. 14, all issued similar Edicts, either before the sitting of the Federal Diet on Dec. 10, or, as in the last two cases, probably before they had been communicated to the state in question.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

But her blundering attempts at persecution were now being directed by an able and relentless mind, which tolerated no bungling, and by December 10, 1835, Münch-Bellinghausen was in a position to read a report to the Diet, which showed a knowledge of these authors, most of them Prussians, to which Prussia had never attained, and to propose a set of Edicts, which, had they been adopted, would have cooked the Young Germans' goose once and for all, and, moreover, the goose which laid their golden eggs.

Now why should Metternich have taken all this trouble? What were the Young Germans to him, that he should have put so gigantic a machinery in motion, in order to wipe them off the face of the literary world? A question easy enough to answer, some may say. The untiring antagonist of liberalism, the sworn and bitter foe of revolutionary tendencies, the reactionary somnambulist, who walked amid voices always whispering to him of conspiracies and revolutions, surely such a man, born under so evil a star, was destined to discover just such a mare's nest as this.

This explanation undoubtedly covers most of the facts, yet there were two added reasons which confirmed Metternich's anxiety to stamp out the Young German bonfire and to scatter the ashes to the wind. The first was the inclusion of the name of Heine in the group of men brought under his notice. Now Metternich held an exaggerated view of Heine. He magnified his faults into glaring vices, interpreting his light life as evidence of the grossest immorality; at the same time he regarded his gifts almost with awe, and certainly over-estimated his influence and importance in Germany, that is to say, he thought Heine much more dangerous than he really was.

In 1832 he caused Gentz to write to Cotta to protest against the *Französische Zustände* then appearing in the *Allgemeine Zeitung*[1]. In this letter such expressions as 'schmächliche Artikel...Feuerbrand... pöbelhafter Muthwille...giftige Ausschweifung...verruchter Abentheurer,' which are out of all proportion to the tone of the articles, show how great the danger appeared to Austria, and the fact that Cotta obeyed instructions and discontinued Heine's contributions is proof that he realised that Metternich was in earnest.

How deeply the Austrian statesman was convinced of Heine's cynicism and immorality and yet at the same time of his talent is clear from the words with which he greeted the news of Heine's death:

[1] F. v. Gentz, *Schriften*, Mannheim, 1838–40, v, pp. 211 ff. Dated April 21, 1832.

Digitized by Google Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Heinrich Heine ist soeben gestorben (17. Februar 1856); dass die Urtheile, welche die Zeitgenossen über den geistig hoch und moralisch in einem Pfuhl der Unsitte gestandenen Dichter fällen, sich feindlich gegenüber stehen müssen, ist wohl sehr erklärlich. Heine war ein grosser Dichter, eine auf der niedrigsten Stufe der Moralität stehende, aber mit grossen Geistesgaben betheilte Persönlichkeit und vor allem ein ausgeprägter Cyniker[1].

As early as February 1834 Metternich was informed of what was to be expected of *Salon II*[2]; it is interesting to realise that he thought it worth his while to employ spies, who watched Heine and Börne in Paris and sent him long and elaborate reports. Two such reports have been communicated by Draeger. The longest, signed von Bornstett and dated October 28, 1835, although not sent off from Paris until November 17, earned its author 500 francs. The assumption that Metternich was accumulating material for his war against the Young Germans is suggested by these dates. The report gives an extremely unflattering portrait of Heine: 'Persönlich feig, lügnerisch und seinem besten Freunde untreu werdend, ist er jeder Festigkeit unfähig, veränderlich wie eine Kokette, boshaft wie eine Schlange, aber auch glänzend und schillernd wie eine solche, giftig[3].' Von Bornstett contends that Heine can only be considered dangerous to Germany as a journalist, and concludes with the suggestion that he might be bribed to fight on the other side. A pencilled note in the margin to the effect: 'Heine's Gefährlichkeit ist nicht im Verhältnisse mit dem Geldopfer, das man bringen müsste, um ihn zu gewinnen und festzuhalten[4],' shows that Metternich, for all his fear of Heine, was not prepared to spend good Austrian money on a wretch whom he could crush with laws. Börne is treated much more sympathetically in this report. He is described as a far more admirable character, but also as a more dangerous adversary. Von Bornstett reports that Börne wishes to act on the German masses by means of pamphlets and newspaper articles, and another pencilled note: 'Gegen dieses Uibel vermögen Bundesgesetze über die Presse das Meiste[5],' makes one wonder anew how it came about that one so thoroughly astute as Metternich, and so well aware of Börne's activities, should lose sight of this author altogether during the ensuing conflict. A possible solution of this vexed question may occur later.

But if Metternich could forget Börne, Prussia showed herself capable of a far more startling lack of memory. From the Edicts of November 14,

[1] *Aus Metternich's nachgelassenen Papieren*, Vienna, 1880–1884, VIII, p. 584. It is curious to hear such a stern condemnation from the mouth of a notoriously loose liver.
[2] *Ibid.*, V, p. 575.
[3] Draeger, *op. cit.*, p. 159.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 160.
[5] *Ibid.*, p. 160.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

1835, which were designed to crush the school so utterly that its very name should become a myth, which condemned books yet unconceived in their authors' brains, and which gave proof of an all-embracing ruthlessness for which it would be hard to find a precedent, from these most sweeping Edicts the name of Heine was inexplicably omitted. Inexplicably, inexcusably, since he had long been Prussia's particular *bête noire*, and had moreover been stigmatised by the 'Obercensurcollegium' on April 30 as the most infamous of the band; yet now that same court drew up a report on which the Prussian Edicts were based, substituted Gutzkow for Heine, and went their ways rejoicing.

It seems possible that this omission was the result of blind obedience to Austria, whose steady and relentless pressure was by now making itself felt. For Metternich had drawn the particular attention of Wittgenstein to Gutzkow and Wienbarg, and had recommended Menzel's articles[1]. Although Hengstenberg, a protégé of the Prussian court, was giving a meticulously exhaustive account of the school, in a paper moreover published in Berlin, yet he appears to have been unheeded[2]. The Prussian authorities were told to read Menzel, and they read Menzel. Menzel said nothing about Heine, so Heine escaped. It is only surprising in this case that Mundt and Laube should have been included. Yet even so a doubt occurs, for in the letter dated October 31, in which Metternich opened the subject to Wittgenstein with the mention of *Wally*, Gutzkow, Wienbarg and Menzel's articles, he included an 'Anlage' which Draeger affirms to be the report read by Münch-Bellinghausen to the Federal Diet on December 10, in which Heine appears in all the glaring limelight of Metternich's hatred as the leader of the school, the chief conspirator, the most dangerous, daring and insidious of them all[3]. The only omission in the copy sent to Berlin, according to Draeger, consists of the concluding paragraphs dealing with the measures to be adopted against the new literature. It seems almost blasphemous (from Prussia's point of view) to wonder if Wittgenstein ever read this report. But indeed one may as well abandon the task of providing a reasonable explanation for what seems to have been a case of inefficiency heightened by fluster. Metternich had much the same effect on the Prussian high command as a well-trained sheep-dog barking at his flock.

[1] On Oct. 31, 1835.

[2] O. L. B. Wolff also gave an account of the school in *Minerva*, Jena, Oct. 1835. He added Kühne to the list, and his report, though on the whole sympathetic in tone, might have furnished the authorities with many useful details. He calls Laube a German Saint-Simonian. He seems to have been entirely ignored except by Mundt. Cf. *Literarischer Zodiacus*, II, p. 378.

[3] Proelss, *Das junge Deutschland*, Stuttgart, 1892, pp. 612 ff., gives part of this report

Digitized by Google Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

As was but to be expected Metternich was far from pleased when the joyfully heralded Edicts at last reached him in Vienna. His first step was to communicate at once with Münch-Bellinghausen, in order to make sure that a like omission did not occur at the approaching sitting of the Federal Diet:

Unbillig wäre es von dieser Liste den geistigen Vater des jungen Deutschlands, den berüchtigten Heine auszuschliessen. Vielleicht dürfte er sogar aus dem Preuss. Verbote nur desshalb ausgelassen worden seyn, weil über ihn etwa schon früher in Preussen das Interdict erging. Jedenfalls muss seiner am Bunde bei der zu treffenden Maassregel die gebührende Erwähnung gemacht und auch seiner gewöhnlichen Verlagshandlung—der Hoffmann Campeschen in Hamburg, das Schicksal der Buchhandlung Löwenthal zum verwarnenden Beispiel *namentlich* vorgehalten werden[1].

His second step was to write to Wittgenstein and draw his attention to Heine, whom he calls 'der grösste Kopf unter den Verschworenen,' and to *Salon II*, 'die Quintessenz der Absichten und Hoffnungen der Bagage mit der wir uns beschäftigen.' There follows a panegyric on Heine's style, and the noteworthy fact is mentioned that the German version of *Salon II* omits the attacks on Protestantism which appeared in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*. He continues on a note of undisguised bitterness and reproach:

Hat man zu Berlin Werth an diese *Ur*-Produkte gelegt? Ich zweifle sehr daran und in der Sache liegt abermals ein Beweiss, wie es um die Regierungen steht. In der höchsten Sphäre, kann man sich mit solchen Sachen nicht abgeben und in den unteren mangelt entweder der Wille oder die Erkenntniss. Am Tage wo *oben* die Entdeckungen gemacht werden, hat das Feuer meist bereits das halbe Hab und Gut, verzehrt oder so mit Russ und Rauch geschwängert, dass die Ware unbrauchbar geworden ist[2].

The great man was undoubtedly angry, but he was shortly to be appeased. The appearance of the *Romantische Schule*[3] in December 1835 jogged the sluggish memory of the 'Obercensurcollegium,' and on the occasion of the prohibition of this book, all Heine's past and future writings were likewise placed under the ban[4].

The fact that Metternich regarded Heine as the chief figure among the supposed conspirators, must, I think, be allowed to have had some influence on the deep suspicion with which he favoured the Young Germans; but there is an even more interesting fact which helps to account for the drastic measures he took to suppress them, the fact that they held and advocated Saint-Simonian theories.

Metternich had known Saint-Simon in Paris in 1809, and had formed

[1] Draeger, *op. cit.*, p. 156. Letter dated Nov. 30, 1835.
[2] *Ibid.*, letter dated Dec. 8, 1835.
[3] An enlarged edition of *Zur Geschichte der neueren schönen Literatur in Deutschland*.
[4] I am inclined to agree with Proelss that this letter of Metternich's could not have arrived in Berlin in time to influence the new Edict. Draeger on the other hand assumes that it did.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

a very unfavourable estimate of his character. He calls him 'ein ausgemachter Cynischer Narr' and 'ein ganz ungeregelter Mensch.' We are led to conclude that his observations were made in the days when the philosopher was seeing life, the better to be able to know it. Long years after, a strange chance drew Metternich's attention to the disciples of Saint-Simon. This chance had a string of curious causes behind it. It began with the phantom visit to Mayence, a visit which the Saint-Simonians denied that they had made, but which was announced in the local papers[1]. This visit, whether real or imaginary, caused such alarm in catholic circles, that the Archbishop of Trier thought it incumbent on him to write a pastoral letter to the clergy of his diocese, warning them against the Saint-Simonians. It was reprinted in the *Allgemeine Preussische Staatszeitung*, an action which hurt the feelings of the Saint-Simonians to such an extent, that they were unable ever again to think of Prussia in the old way. Their attitude towards this state, built up on entirely false premises and giving proof of almost unbelievable blindness, had hitherto been one of the most resolute trust and the most undaunted idealism. All this now lay shattered, and the dreams of conquering the world with the help of Prussia had to be abandoned. But the Saint-Simonians could not live without dreams; it cost them less effort to place Austria on the high mountain top of their hopes, an action so intrinsically absurd, and showing such blank ignorance of the aims and ideals of the imperial government, that imagination boggles at the task of characterising it adequately. The letter which Enfantin wrote to Heine from the Nile, October 11, 1835, is instinct with the glorification of Austria and of Metternich. Austria is assigned the rôle of priest in the Federal States, and the reactionary policy of the Austrian Empire is explained away in the following airy manner:

> Entourée de nations où fermente la liberté, sa voix calme et grave répète sans cesse: Enfants, vous n'aimez pas l'ordre, vous n'êtes pas mûrs pour la liberté[2].

Whilst the persecution of youth by the hoary state is lightly touched upon and as lightly dismissed:

> ...et de même l'Autriche, avec un instinct sublime, et plein de prudence, de raison, de bonhomie, l'Autriche n'a pas encore pu croire que les jeunes gens des écoles, et les avocats et les médecins, et les beaux parleurs des salons connussent mieux les besoins des peuples et entendissent mieux la politique européenne, universelle, que M. de Metternich et tous ses vieux diplomates et administrateurs, nés, élevés et blanchis dans les affaires[3].

Enfantin explaining Metternich to Heine on these lines, the situation

[1] Cf. *Allgemeine Zeitung* (Augsburg), Jan. 4, 1832 and *Globe*, March 7, 1832.
[2] Saint-Simon et Enfantin, *Oeuvres*, x, p. 119.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 121.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

is not without its charm. But a still more amusing situation was adumbrated, for Enfantin conceived the magnificently absurd idea of approaching Metternich direct and winning him over to Saint-Simonism[1]. He was unable however to put this project into execution. Life became all too exorbitant in her demands on the sect; the world was too much with them, and they escaped, not to Austria, but to Ménilmontant, and later to the East. Thus we are cheated of an interview between Metternich and Enfantin, an interview in which the subtle diplomacy of the one would have met and (who can doubt it?) disproved the fantastic claims of the other. It would have been the contact, not only between two very different men, statesman and prophet, but also between two very different worlds; the one built on the stronghold of the past, in all the strength of possession and in all the pride of place; the other founded only on belief in the future, invisible and intangible, yet with something eternal at its heart. No one will deny to-day that, for all his absurdity, Enfantin gauged the future more accurately than Metternich for all his wisdom; yet it is strangely impossible to imagine that Metternich would have been worsted in the interview. Unluckily it never took place.

Some action, however, was undertaken. With the extraordinary lack of humour which was one of his most outstanding characteristics, Enfantin solemnly sent to Metternich a complete collection of the acts of the Saint-Simonians, hoping one knows not what stupendous result:

> Ich weiss nicht, wodurch ich zu jener Zeit, in welcher der St Simonismus in Frankreich im Aufschwung war, dessen Oberhäuptern Stoff zur Meinung bot, als könnte ich für denselben gewonnen werden.

So Metternich wrote ironically many years later:

> Den Beweis, dass dieser Wahn bei denselben herrschte, erhielt ich durch eine Zuschrift des Père Enfantin, welche mir in Folge eines Beschlusses der obersten 'Saint Synode' sich benennenden Behörde die vollständige Sammlung der auf die Secte Beziehung habenden Acten übersendete. Ich legte dieselbe einfach *ad acta*[2].

However magnificent in its disdain the gesture with which Metternich tossed aside the papers on which Enfantin had built such extravagant hopes, yet the crafty statesman possessed a long memory. Moreover Chevalier was obliging enough to ask for an interview in 1835[3], and thus brought the whole 'very tragical mirth' of Saint-Simonism back to the very mind on whose forgetfulness the safety of the Young Germans may partly have depended. For it seems from the tone of Metternich's utterances that their connection with Saint-Simonism caused him real

[1] Cf. *Allgemeine Zeitung*, April 4 and 19, 1832.
[2] *Aus Metternich's nachgelassenen Papieren*, VIII, p. 575. Dated 1853.
[3] For this interview, cf. *ibid.*, pp. 575–576.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

dismay. In a special addendum to a letter to Wittgenstein of Nov. 26, 1835, in which he expressed his 'Gefühle über die Sache,' Draeger tells us:

> Gab er seiner grossen Sorge für das Bestehen des Christentums und damit der modernen Gesellschaft Ausdruck, falls man nicht dem verderblichen Treiben der Richtung, die ganz im St Simonismus wurzele, entgegenträte. Er schaute bereits im Geiste eine Periode der furchtbarsten Kämpfe zwischen den Rechten des alten christlichen Europas und der sich heranbildenden neuen antichristlichen Zeit, der es an allen Greueln der Verwüstung, an Unterdrückung, Blut- und Gewalttat aller Art nicht fehlen würde[1].

And in the following letter of November 30, 1835, he once more insisted on the connection between the German school of writers and the French religious sect[2]:

> In dem Treiben der jungen Litteraten mit dem St Simonismus liegt das Gemeinsame, dass beyde Sekten sich *einen Gott* zu schaffen bemühen: Göthe soll augenscheinlich in Deutschland die Stelle des ebenfalls verstorbenen St Simon für die Franzosen spielen. Diese Götter gleichen sich nicht; Göthe war ein ebenso grosser Dichter als St Simon den ich persönlich gekannt habe, ein ausgemachter Cynischer Narr war. Göthe war ein im Leben geregelter und St Simon ein ganz ungeregelter Mensch. Göthe hatte allerdings nur wenige rein moralische und religiöse Begriffe; er war ein Sinnen Mensch und seine Wahlverwandtschaften sind ein höchst unmoralisches der neuen Religion des Fleisches hingeneigtes Buch. Aus Alledem ergeht noch keine Aehnlichkeit zwischen den beyden Gottheiten. Das wirklich Barroque in der That ist aber, dass die Priester des besseren Gottes weit ärgere Lotterbuben sind als *die* des schlechteren. Die Ursache hiervon ist dass schlechte Moden in Deutschland stets übertrieben werden und dass der Sinn der Franzosen im Schlechten stets praktischer ist als der der Deutschen.
>
> Nun sehen Sie, lieber Fürst, dass wir uns über die beym Bundestage zu treffenden Einleitungen verständigen[3].

The last sentence shows clearly that, however much Metternich might be astray about the fundamental resemblance between Saint-Simonism and Young Germany, it was the fact of their connection which made him so particularly anxious to appeal to the Federal Diet and to stamp out the whole brood. Finally, the report drawn up under Metternich's eyes and read by Münch-Bellinghausen to the Federal Diet on December 10, 1835, emphasises the Saint-Simonian theories as part of the dangerous innovations due to Heine:

> ...neu ist ferner die, besonders von Heine zur Anwendung gebrachte, eigens auf die Verführung der Jugend berechnete, innige Verbindung der Blasphemie mit der Aufregung der Sinnlichkeit, sowie die eigenthümliche Einflechtung St. simonistischer und pantheistischer Ideen und die, besonders von dem letztgenannten Schrift-

[1] Draeger, *op. cit.*, pp. 153–154. It is a great pity that the text of the letter is not given, but even this précis of the contents is remarkably illuminating.

[2] Also addressed to Wittgenstein.

[3] Draeger, *op. cit.*, pp. 154–155. The same motif occurs in Metternich's letter to Varnhagen asking for information about the Young Germans: '...und nun hat das *junge Deutschland* den so vielfach verdienten Dichter zu einer Art von Saint-Simonistischer Götter-Potenz erhoben.' *Briefe von Stägemann, Metternich, Heine und Bettina von Arnim*, Leipzig, 1865, pp. 117–118. Letter dated Dec. 19, 1835.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

steller ausgehende, eigenthümliche Verarbeitung aller dieser Elemente zu einem vollständigen System der Gottesläugnung und Unsittlichkeit, welches Heine im zweiten Bande seines Salons sich nicht scheut, als neue Weltreligion zu proklamiren[1].

IV.

But if on the strength of information received involving particularly Heine and Saint-Simonism, Metternich set to work to launch the Prussian and Federal Edicts on a startled world, the question naturally occurs: Who first supplied the information? This question is a difficult one to answer where Metternich is concerned, since he had an army of spies and accredited ambassadors distributed over Europe, part of whose duty it was to bring such manifestations as this Young German literature to his notice. Nevertheless ambassadors have more pressing business, and spies generally wait for instructions; it seems therefore reasonable to suppose that before this organisation was set in motion, Metternich's attention had already been attracted in some other way. This supposition is borne out by the tone of his first letter to Wittgenstein on the subject:

Ich zweifle nicht (he wrote on October 31, 1835) dass Ihnen die neue Richtung, welche eine Abtheilung unserer deutschen Revolutionnaire *dem grossen Werke*, zu geben sich bestrebt, bereits zur Kenntniss gekommen ist... Ich habe ein Netz ausgespannt um die möglichste Kenntniss der Sache selbst zu erlangen; ich bitte Sie hier mein Gehilfe zu sein. Sie haben hierzu alle Mittel denn die Bagage ist meist im Norden oder aus selbem[2].

The net was spread, and indeed some reports had already come to hand. Schönberg, the Austrian ambassador in Stuttgart, was first in the field, as far as I have been able to discover:

Die Uneinigkeit hat ihr Haupt erhoben (he wrote to Metternich on October 23, 1835) und bringt Verwirrung in die feindlichen Reihen. Menzel, der Demagog, tritt offen in die Schranken gegen das junge Deutschland. Hier ein neuer Beleg zu der Tatsache, die nicht ohne Bedeutung ist. Es liegt hierin ein neuer Sieg der guten Sache, nachdem schon so viele ihrer Gegner überwältigt oder abgenutzt, *wider ihren Willen* ihr die besten Dienste leisteten[3].

The 'neuer Beleg' was probably a copy of one of Menzel's articles, and the epithet 'neu' suggests that Schönberg had sent other copies earlier, yet this suggestion would seem to be contradicted by the tone of the letter, in which he has all the appearance of breaking a piece of good but startling news. Two days later, on October 25, he wrote again,

[1] Proelss omits this passage, and Geiger supplies it, pp. 33-34. I have used Karl Fischer's version in *Die Nation und der Bundestag*, Leipzig, 1880, pp. 423–424. Geiger reads *Verflechtung* for *Einflechtung* and *fantastischer* for *pantheistischer*.

[2] Draeger, *op. cit.*, p. 146.

[3] Geiger, *Das junge Deutschland, Studien und Mittheilungen*, Berlin, 1907, p. 174.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

sending 'the end of Menzel's article[1],' and assured Metternich that he would have written earlier on this subject:

> Wenn ich nicht durch Herrn *Rat Jarcke* erfahren hätte, dass er es sich zur besonderen Aufgabe gemacht hätte, einen umständlichen Bericht über den Unfug zu erstatten, den in neuester Zeit das junge Deutschland in der literarischen Welt zu treiben wagt[2].

Jarcke had at one time been professor of criminal law in Berlin, and later became the editor of the *Berliner politisches Wochenblatt*, a journal of violent reactionary and ultramontane tendencies, which had been severely criticised by Laube in the *Blätter für literarische Unterhaltung* and in *Politische Briefe*, whilst the author had been cruelly chastised by Börne in the 85th letter from Paris. He had been summoned from Berlin to Vienna in the autumn of 1832 to take the place of Friedrich Gentz, and had been given a position in the 'Hof- und Staatskanzlei.' He was in Stuttgart in 1835, probably on a special mission to investigate the Young German literature. Most unfortunately his report seems to have disappeared from the Vienna archives, at least Geiger could not find it, so that we have no means of knowing what facts Jarcke brought to Metternich's notice. We can only surmise that, as he was investigating in Stuttgart, his facts will have been on the whole *à la* Menzel. Certainly the article which he wrote on December 12, 1835, *Ueber die Wirksamkeit der loyalen Presse*, with an angry eye fixed on the Young Germans, has the true Menzelian flavour:

> Die schlechte, d. h. die frivole, gotteslästerliche oder absichtlich revolutionäre Presse verdirbt dann rückwärts wirkend die Gesinnung, aus der sie selbst hervorging, und die dadurch gesteigerte Schlechtigkeit der Gesinnung verlangt ihrerseits wieder nach immer stärkern Dosen der *Asa foetida*, welche ihr die Garköche der öffentlichen Meinung diensteifrigst jeden Morgen, ganz nach ihrem Geschmacke bereiten. Welch' hohes Gebot in dieser öffentlichen Steigerung bereits geschehen sey, liegt in den Schriften des 'jungen Deutschlands' vor Aller Augen[3].

It seems clear that Jarcke did not bungle his report from the warm recommendation which Metternich gave him to Wittgenstein in March 1836, in a letter which accompanied a memorandum on Gutzkow's appeal to Tzschoppe and on von Rochow's emendation to the November Edicts, and which Jarcke was entrusted to hand to Wittgenstein personally:

> Er hat bey mir ein *litterarisches* Referat und als solcher kennt er meine Ansichten auf diesem Felde. Sie können in jeder Rücksicht aufrichtig mit ihm sprechen und seiner vollkommen versichert sein[4].

[1] Menzel's articles are dated Sept. 11 and 14, Sept. 28, Oct. 19, Oct. 23 and 26. Schönberg must have been sending on Oct. 19 at latest, since Oct. 23 and 26 form one article, with the words 'Der Schluss folgt' at the end of the first.

[2] Geiger, *Das junge Deutschland*, p. 174.

[3] C. E. Jarcke, *Vermischte Schriften*, Munich, 1839, I, p. 53.

[4] Draeger, *op. cit.*, p. 168.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

It would be interesting to know if Jarcke's report had reached Metternich by October 28, for on that date we find him writing to von Bercks, General Consul in Leipzig, to send him the works of Wienbarg, Gutzkow, Duller and Heine, particularly *Salon II*:

> ...da ich die neuesten Produkte der sich unter dem Namen des jungen Deutschlands ankündigenden Schule unchristlicher, unsittlicher Autoren zu besitzen wünsche[1].

Duller, the editor of the *Frankfurter Phönix*, to which Gutzkow contributed the *Literaturblatt* in 1835, is also mentioned in a report from Frankfurt dated November 11. I am inclined to believe that Jarcke contributed his name. Menzel, who kept a spiteful eye on Gutzkow's movements since their parting, could have supplied this information. It is much less likely that he would have mentioned Heine or *Salon II*, which he did not review until March of the following year. Jarcke may have brought this book to Metternich's notice, but I think myself that, if he did so, he was carrying coals to Newcastle. Before these books arrived from Leipzig[2], that is to say, on October 31, Metternich wrote his first letter to Wittgenstein on the Young Germans, and enclosed the famous 'Anlage.' At that date his case against the Young Germans was already complete. The letter makes a special mention of *Wally* (spelt *Walli*), of Menzel's articles against this novel, and of the *Erklärung* of Gutzkow and Wienbarg in the *Allgemeine Zeitung* of October 26. There are two points of importance here. In the first place, Metternich mentions only Menzel's articles against *Wally* (September 11 and 14). These might include the *Zweite und Dritte Abfertigung des Dr Gutzkow* (September 28, and October 19), but he makes no reference to the article entitled *Unmoralische Literatur* (October 23 and 26), a review of the *Aesthetische Feldzüge*. It seems likely therefore that he had not seen this article, a point of some importance, for on October 26 Menzel made his first reference to Saint-Simonism. Secondly, Metternich had read the *Erklärung* of October 26, which gave a full list of the future contributors to the *Deutsche Revue* headed by the names Börne, Heine, Laube and Mundt. Here, one might think, was a word to the wise, but Metternich continued to ignore Börne, although he expressed himself much shocked to find Varnhagen and Gans in this *galère*.

The 'Anlage,' that is to say, the report on which the Federal Edicts were based, and which was drawn up under Metternich's eyes, is

[1] Geiger, *Das junge Deutschland*, pp. 175–176.
[2] They were sent off on Dec. 7; cf. K. Glossy, *Literarische Geheimberichte aus dem Vormärz*, *Jahrbuch der Grillparzer-Gesellschaft*, Vienna, 1912, I, p. xciii.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

composed on the following lines[1]. Beaten in the political field, the revolutionary press is attempting to attain its ends by means of an anti-Christian, blasphemous and immoral literature, whose chief exponent is Heinrich Heine in Paris. The new features of this literary propaganda are to be found in the combination of blasphemy and sensuality, much used by Heine for the purpose of seducing youth, the remarkable introduction of Saint-Simonian and pantheistic ideas, and the elaboration of all these elements into a complete system of blasphemy and immorality, which Heine has the effrontery to proclaim as the New Religion in the second volume of his *Salon*. His works have brought forth adepts and apostles of the New Religion, who have formed a literary coterie called Young Germany for the express purpose of propagating these doctrines.

The report then goes on to characterise *Wally*, the *Aesthetische Feldzüge* and Gutzkow's *Vorrede zu Schleiermacher's Vertraute Briefe über die Lucinde* as works showing this tendency, and finally names Heine, Gutzkow, Wienbarg, Mundt and Laube as the members of the school, and Hoffmann and Campe as their chief publishers.

Now there is one place and one only where all these facts and fancies are to be found (with the exception of the criticism of *Wally*, which Metternich almost certainly owed to Menzel), and this place is Hengstenberg's *Evangelische Kirchenzeitung*. His articles of August 8 and 12 and of October 17, 21 and 24 had not only named Heine as the leader of the school with special reference to *Salon II*, he had also reviewed the *Vorrede*, the *Aesthetische Feldzüge* and *Madonna*. He had drawn attention to Hoffmann and Campe, and had included Laube in the list of Young Germans. Finally, and most important of all, he had clearly seen and loudly proclaimed the Saint-Simonian origin of their theories. When we see the report built up entirely on these lines, omitting no single fact which Hengstenberg had supplied, and following his whole attitude towards the school so closely, it becomes very difficult not to be convinced that Hengstenberg's articles had come under Metternich's notice. I am inclined to believe that Hengstenberg's articles first drew Metternich's attention to the Young Germans, that he then set his intelligence department to work, and thus became acquainted with Menzel's contributions. Certainly Hengstenberg, by pushing Heine into the forefront, and by uttering the name of Saint-Simon, touched two chords peculiarly liable to awaken an anxious echo in Metternich's mind.

[1] Cf. Proelss, *op. cit.*, pp. 612 ff., Geiger, *Das junge Deutschland und die preussische Censur*, pp. 33–34, Fischer, *op. cit.*, pp. 423–424.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

That Hengstenberg was never mentioned by the statesman need cause no surprise, since it is unlikely that an orthodox catholic would have been eager to stress the debt to a bigoted heretic, who moreover was guilty of the lack of tact of declaring that the Saint-Simonian criticism of Christianity was justified in so far as it applied to catholicism. The theory that Metternich owed his conception of the Young Germans to Hengstenberg also helps to account for the omission of Börne's name from the Edicts, and indeed the name of Börne would have been strangely out of place, if Metternich were aiming at Saint-Simonism; for what had Börne to do with the rehabilitation of the flesh? Thus a teasing little fact is accounted for, and helps to establish the unity of conception underlying the report. There are no actual textual resemblances between Hengstenberg's articles and the report, but a curiously unsuitable simile used by the journalist and repeated by the statesman has strengthened me in the conviction that Metternich saw the *Evangelische Kirchenzeitung*. On October 21, 1835, Hengstenberg made great play with the supposed similarity between Fieschi and the Young Germans:

> War er nicht praktisch und faktisch von eurer Gemeinde, ihr Wiederhersteller? O wie das Fleisch so herrlich blüht unter euren Ideen, ja, wie es blutet!...
>
> Und so lange wir wissen, dass die Wollust auf einer Wurzel ruht mit der Grausamkeit, und die dogmatisch ausstaffirte auf einem Stamme mit der raffinirten Kunst der Höllenmaschinen...

This far-fetched parallel struck me when I first read it as so intrinsically absurd, that I marvelled how Hengstenberg could have conceived anything so silly and so monstrously unfair; and behold, in Metternich's oft-quoted letter to Wittgenstein of October 31, I found the same parallel used in much the same way:

> *Die Revolution*—diess ist nun bewiesen—fühlt sich gedrängt, denn sonst—(sie müsste nun verrückt geworden sein)—würde sie sich nicht in dem Masse blossstellen wie sie diess durch materielle und intellektuelle Höllen Maschinen thut![1]

Great minds think alike, we are told; yet I am inclined to pay Metternich the compliment of supposing that this simile was not of his own invention.

Nor is this all. We have seen that Metternich supposed the Young Germans to be anxious to set up Goethe as their God[2]. As the attitude of some of them towards Goethe was almost hostile at this period, and as none of them shared anything like the unqualified enthusiasm which Metternich postulates, I wondered at first whether it was their connection with Varnhagen von Ense that led him to this fanciful conclusion.

[1] Draeger, *op. cit.*, p. 146.
[2] Letter quoted above dated Nov. 30, 1835.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

I believe, however, that the key to this puzzle is to be found in the *Evangelische Kirchenzeitung*:

> So ist zum Beispiel die Liebe zu Jesu in der Welt keine Ehre, wohl aber die Liebe zu *Göthe*. Wer Christi Bild mit begeisterten Hingebung und Liebe im Herzen trägt, und ihn anbetet, wird ein beschränkter Herrnhuter genannt werden. Wer auf dieselbe Weise an *Göthe* hängt, wird zu den Auserwählten der geistreichen Weltfrommen gezählt werden.

Thus Hengstenberg wrote bitterly in his last article on the 'Rehabilitatoren,' November 21, 1835, and Metternich's letter of November 30 sounds like the echo a small voice may produce from a deep and mysterious cave.

It was not moreover until after October 31, that the net which Metternich had spread to catch the Young Germans began to yield results, with the exception of Schönberg's report and possibly Jarcke's[1]. Interesting as the accounts are which ran in from ambassadors and spies in Frankfurt, Berlin, Brussels, Paris and elsewhere, they are too late in date to have helped Metternich in the composition of the 'Anlage.' Nor did he get his facts from the Prussian government, although the 'Obercensurcollegium' could have supplied them all with the exception of *Wally* and the Saint-Simonian influence, for although he asked for help in his letter to Wittgenstein of October 31, the enclosed 'Anlage' showed that he was already in possession of all the essential data. It has generally been assumed that Menzel was his authority, a rough and ready solution, which overlooks the fact that Menzel named only Gutzkow and Wienbarg until 1836, but which has been adopted by posterity, which repeats parrot-wise the epithet 'Denunciant' first bestowed on Menzel by Heine. From the moral point of view this epithet is entirely justified. Only a one-sided partisan like Treitschke could attempt to absolve Menzel, the most brilliant lawyer could only plead extenuating circumstances. His intentions were undoubtedly denunciatory, and the means he adopted the most damaging and libellous at his command. The only question that can interest an impartial mind is how far he succeeded.

His articles were certainly not without effect. They did not influence the Prussian prohibition of *Wally*, but they were brought to the notice of Metternich by Schönberg, and earned Gutzkow his tardy inclusion among the Young Germans in Prussia. They were also responsible for the confiscation of *Wally* in the 'Obermainkreis' on October 16, in Munich on October 17, and in Mannheim on November 13. They led

[1] Glossy, *op. cit.*, has printed a large number of these reports, which began to come thick and fast from Nov. 11 onwards. Geiger and Draeger have communicated others. I have nowhere found any mention of the Saint-Simonian influence.

Digitized by Google Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

to the prohibition of the *Deutsche Revue*, they wrecked Löwenthal's firm, involved the publisher and the author in a lawsuit, and were responsible for Gutzkow's imprisonment and trial. In a word Menzel achieved just what he set out to perform: he put a stopper on the *Deutsche Revue* and made Gutzkow's name to stink in the nostrils of the authorities. Over and above all this, his use of the terms 'Junges Deutschland' and 'Jeune Allemagne' might have attracted the attention of the governments, had their attention not already been attracted. But he taught Prussia nothing that Prussia had not already known in April 1835, except that Gutzkow was a member of the band. I believe also that he taught Metternich nothing which that statesman had not already learnt from Hengstenberg, except the existence of *Wally*, that unfortunate and ill-fated novel. Had Menzel stood alone, it is possible that the government reprisals might have been confined to the prohibition of the *Deutsche Revue* and to the persecution of Gutzkow and Wienbarg; but he did not stand alone. The much more important information which Hengstenberg supplied was of a nature to cause Metternich peculiar alarm. Prussia was prodded up into issuing the November Edicts, and the machinery of the Federal Diet was set in motion. Prussia might never have taken this step if Metternich had not intervened. Metternich might not have intervened with quite the same determination if Hengstenberg had not let two such alarming looking cats out of such a very black bag.

The Federal Diet, weakened by the sturdy opposition of Württemberg and Bavaria on constitutional grounds[1], finally published Edicts, which took the form of an ambiguously-worded warning; this warning, however, might be, and often was, mistaken for the absolute prohibition which Metternich had intended. Diplomatically speaking these Edicts were an anti-climax, practically speaking they did incalculable harm to the authors against whom they were directed. They had a most unhappy effect, not only on the literary output of the victims, but also on their minds and on their characters.

When we think of them in later life, embittered, quarrelsome, suspicious and unhappy, sometimes cowardly and even treacherous; when we realise that one of them was a victim to the terrible mania of persecution, and that the mind of another became permanently clouded; then when we look back on their eager, joyous, generous youth, their recklessness, their visions and ideals, absurd perhaps, but still ideals and visions, the extent of the harm for which the Prussian and Federal

[1] Cf. Houben, *op. cit.*, pp. 69–76.

Digitized by Google

Original from
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Edicts were responsible is borne in on our minds. Many names were involved in the composition of these Edicts; Tzschoppe in particular must bear a large share of the blame in Prussia, but the mind which was responsible in the last resort was the mind of Metternich, whilst the voice was the voice of Hengstenberg. It seems possible on considering the facts given above, that, had it not been for the presence of that firebrand Heine in their midst, and for the notorious name of Saint-Simon on their lips, they might have escaped more lightly. So much at least is certain. Metternich in his war against Young Germany singled out Heine in the fight and the blows he directed against the school were aimed at a tendency already known and hated under a different name.

E. M. BUTLER.

CAMBRIDGE.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

THE FRISIAN POEMS IN TITIA BRONGERSMA'S 'BRONSWAAN.'

In a collection of poems by Titia Brongersma published at Groningen in 1686 are four poems in Frisian, which, both on linguistic and literary grounds, deserve to be rescued from oblivion. The book bears as its full title: *De Bron-swaan, of Mengelgedigten van Titia Brongersma, bestaande in Lof-Gedigten, Geestelijke stoffen, Gesangen, Af-beeldingen*[1], *Verjaar-Gedichten, Lijk-klachten, Bruylofts-Sangen, Vertalingen, Byvallen*[2], *Om-geefsels*[3], *en Raatselen*; it was printed by Carel Pieman ('Boekdrukker tussen beyde Markten'). The frontispiece is minutely described by the poetess herself in a poem of thanks (p. 235) to the Groningen artist E. J. de Wolff. It depicts a swan rising from the water with outstretched wings and craned neck, while a company of ladies on the rocky shore listen to one of their number reciting; beyond them in the background on the right a windmill and a church-steeple, stepped and surmounted by a weather-cock, are visible behind a dyke or wall. It is remarkable that no copy of this book is to be found in the British Museum nor is it entered in L. D. Petit's catalogue of the Leiden library. I owe my acquaintance with it to my friend Professor Priebsch, who purchased it some years ago in a London bookshop. Some former possessor has shown his interest in the Frisian poems, to which no specific reference is made in the title-page, by writing a note in an eighteenth century hand on the inner flyleaf facing the frontispiece: *Continet hoc volumen, praeter poemata Hollandica, etiam varia carmina antiquâ Linguâ frisicâ conscripta. Vide pag.* 156.—164.—166.—192. *Haec Lingua antiquorum frisonum etiamnum existit vernacula in parte frisiae.* The last phrase points to an Englishman rather than a Dutchman as the writer of the note.

From van der Aa's *Biographisch Woordenboek der Nederlanden* (Haarlem, 1855), supplemented by de Chalmot's biographical dictionary (Amsterdam, 1798) we learn that Titia Brongersma was a younger daughter of an influential family from the province of Stad en Lande,

[1] The 'Afbeeldingen' are poems descriptive of portraits received from friends.
[2] The 'Byvallen' are poems expressing thanks to those who helped in the production of the *Bronswaan*.
[3] The 'Omgeefsels' contain anagrams or hidden names. It is noteworthy that none of the annotated words are given in these senses in the *Alg. Wb. der Ndl. Taal*.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

i.e. Groningen[1], that she was born at Dokkum in Friesland (de Chalmot: Groningen) and lived at Groningen. Here she had printed not only the *Bronswaan*, but also a volume *Hemelsche Orgeltoonen*, containing religious poems. Her work is entirely ignored by Witsen Geysbeek's *Biographisch anthologisch en critisch woordenboek der nederduitsche dichters* (Amsterdam, 1821–7). de Chalmot's flattering view of her as 'een buitengemeen geestig meisje' who composed many 'zoetvloeijende digtstukjes' is not shared by van der Aa, who considers her work 'vrij onbeduidend' and characterizes her panegyrists like Mensinga, L. Smids and N. Blancardus (who exalted her above Virgil, Horace, Seneca and Juvenal!) as being gallants rather than connoisseurs. He mentions further her partiality to mythological allusions and the presence of French and Frisian verses among her poems, also her archaeological interests, which must have received much stimulus from her discovery at Whitsun 1685 of ancient pottery and human remains in the famous Giant's Graves of the province of Drenthe. The full story of this episode is related by Titia's friend Ludolph Smids in his *Schatkamer der nederlandschen Oudheiden* (Amsterdam, 1711) s.v. *Steenhoopen, anders Hunnebedden* p. 326 (referred to by Chalmot and van der Aa). Smids describes how his 'hertvriendin,' who was known to all by her *Bronswaan*, while on a visit to the Lenting family in Borger, brought to light a number of brownish-blue and dark red earthenware vessels, round in shape but roughly formed, some having two and some four ears. These vessels, he says, crumbled to pieces, letting fall a quantity of bones and ashes. His friend had been the first to stir the earth under the mounds: 'waarlijk een daad, om door de Dichtkunst vereeuwigd te worden!' Smids is moved to compose a *Swabische Lykbus* over the venerable remains, which begins (p. 327) 'k heb op een boesem, eer men my begroef, gerust,' and concludes with the couplet:

Leg neder! overdek de beend'ren en de fles!
En strek my wederom een trouwe minnares!

Titia refers to this poem on p. 9 of her *Bronswaan* and has herself published one on the same theme on the preceding page. A note at the end of Smids' article indicates that another friend of the poetess, Stephen Blankard, was interested in the remains. The *Schatkamer* further provides a picture of the scene, in which a female figure (doubtless the poetess) clad in a flowing garment and wearing a bracelet on her upper arm receives an earthen vessel from the hands of a gentleman, behind whom a servant carries other remains. In the centre are the megaliths

[1] The Duke of Guelders was invested with both city and surrounding country by Charles V in 1515, after they had long been held separately.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

with three men excavating in front of the largest trilithon, while a horseman is seen passing into the woods on the right.

The Dutch poems of the *Bronswaan* furnish some additional particulars of Titia's life and surroundings. The preface indicates that the *Bronswaan* was her first publication, but there is evidence of some of her poems having been composed as early as the seventies. She was a spinster (*à lectissima ac ornatissima virgine*), had lost both parents, whose picture hangs in her room (p. 191), but had a brother Conraad (p. 97) and a sister A. (p. 76) still living. Her niece Margareta Gratema, whom she reproaches (p. 37) for having forgotten to present her with a birthday gift, is mourned as dead in another poem (p. 209), her death having taken place at Groningen in 1686. Among the many acquaintances to whom she addresses her occasional poems, may be mentioned Ludolf Smids, Doctor of Medicine, whose tragedy, *Rodrik, Konink der Gotten*, is commended on p. 74, Nicolaus Blancardus, professor at Franeker[1], Johan Mensinga, professor at Groningen, and the Frisian poet Adriaan Tymens. In one poem she shows her admiration for Vondel (p. 174) and in another for Ronsard (p. 184). In several others reference is made to a family named Joly, the members of which would seem to be skilled in the accomplishments of lace-making, flower-painting, drawing and calligraphy. There is the usual adulation of royal personages in the welcome to Prince Henrik Casimir of Nassau and his wife Aemilia, and to Wilhelm Georg Friso, Prince of Nassau; the nobility are represented by Isabella Catharina Maria, baroness of Heerema. That Titia maintained some connexion with Dokkum appears from her lament for the Dokkum preacher J. de Bruyn (p. 213) and her praise of the musicians and connoisseurs of that town (p. 65).

The jumbled character of the collection is best shown by picking out a few of the topics treated. They range from the deed of a Lyons woman—'a raging lioness'—who, in male attire, attacked and stabbed her betrayer outside the theatre in January, 1685, to the destruction of a spider's web by the blasts of Boreas, from the tale of an inquisitive woman who pushed her way through a squadron of cavalry, undismayed by horses and muskets, to an encomium of the virtues of tea (p. 149). It is rather curious that none of the poems celebrate the stout resistance offered by the city of Groningen in 1672 to the beleaguering forces of the warlike bishop of Münster.

Titia Brongersma's poetic diction is turgid to a degree and ridicu-

[1] One poem celebrates the centenary of the foundation of this University (Sept. 24, 1685).

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

lously ornate. Her verses abound in the most glaringly inappropriate classical allusions. A little relief is afforded by her religious poetry (pp. 101–122), but that too is somewhat frigid. It is all the more remarkable that we find embedded in this very unpromising soil four rustic poems in Frisian, which are, in truth, not graceful or comely, but reproduce with delightful naïveté the life of the Frisian peasants in their simple daily tasks and in all their broad humour. Other writers in Holland before Titia's time had escaped from the monotony of imitating antique models and had tried their hands at genuine bucolic poetry. Kalff in his *Geschiedenis der nederlandschen letterkunde* singles out Breero's *Klucht van de koe* (1612), *Klucht van den molenaar* (1613), *Klucht van Symen sonder soeticheyt* (1619) and Lucas Rotgans' *Boere-kermis*. These realistic presentments, in which dialect plays some part, are in Kalff's opinion the authors' best work. Frisian, too, had undergone a considerable revival as a literary medium through the work of Gysbert Japiks, the *Sotteclucht van een advocaat ende een boer* (1618) by Starter having been rather a flash in the pan. In spite of Japiks, however, the Groningen writers continued to write in Dutch and to display their classical tags (cf. Kalff, *op. cit.*, vol. IV, pp. 505 ff.).

Outside of Holland the most interesting parallels to Titia Brongersma's bucolics are to be found among North German writers of approximately the same period. R. Priebsch discovered in MS. Sloane 1021 of the British Museum and published in 1914 a 'Bauernlied' by Simon Dach, the author of the famous *Anke von Tharau*, a 'nova cantilena amatoria rustica,' which begins with the words 'Grethke, war umb heffstu mi | doch so sehr bedrövet?' and in raciness and forthrightness even outbids our Frisian poems, though parts of it are comparable in spirit to the 'Hotsemans Vryery' reprinted below[1]. In his commentary Priebsch mentions the parodies of the then fashionable pastoral poetry in the guise of Low German songs by N. Paucker in his *Wohlklingende Paucke* (1702), J. Rachel with his *Nu min dochter segg van harten* etc. and the Königsberg poetess Gertrud Möllerin in No. 24 of the *Erster Teil der Parnass-Blumen*. Of considerably earlier date is the work of the Holstein peasant poetess Anna Owena Hoyers, whose anti-clerical satire *De Dörfpape* (1630) is discussed in the *Geschichte der niederdeutschen Literatur* (*Aus Natur und Geisteswelt*, no. 815) by W. Stammler, who compares her realistic inn-scenes with the genre pictures of artists like Ostaede and Brouwer.

[1] Cf. also 'Oldfränkische Schnickschnack twischen Hans und Gretje' in Joachim Beccau's (1620–1755) *Zuverlässige Verkürzung müssiger Stunden* (W. Stammler, *l.c.*, p. 75).

Digitized by Google Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

To avoid obscuring any details of possible linguistic interest I have deemed it advisable to reprint the Frisian poems exactly as they stand. A rough and ready English rendering accompanies the text, and notes—which, it is hoped, will not in view of the difficulties of Frisian be thought excessive—are appended for further elucidation. Like many of the Dutch poems in the book, all the Frisian pieces are set to a certain 'toon' or melody, which usually bears a French title. Unfortunately it has not been possible, in spite of much searching, to trace these melodies to their ultimate home in France.

The authoress uses good broad Landfriesch, not the so-called Stadfriesch with its Dutch admixture. The text is very rich in such characteristic Frisonisms as the following:—(1) in phonology, the assibilation of the velar consonant in *bitins*, *schins*, *tinse*, *sizze*, *lizze*, *meytse*, *kootse*, *plootse*, *tzies*, *liltie*, *meltie*, *tierne* and its vocalization in *dey*, *sey*; the representation of þ by a voiceless consonant in *trije*, *tiouke*, *termin*; loss of nasal before spirant in *ouws*, *rier*, *oors*, *oore*; assimilation in *kaelin*, *stere*, *fijnæ*, *spijn*, *raen*, *laen*; loss of *l* and lengthening of vowel in *haed*, *aede*; loss of initial *h* in *joed*, *jouwir*; the vocalism of *joon*, *hæveg*, *swiete*, *liæef*, *mieg*, *lit*, *græeter*, *wier* (1. where, 2. true), *driuw*, *ickers*, *jarre*, *slaet*, *fiouwir*, *fird*, *harck*; (2) in accidence the pronominal forms *ye*, *i*, *jimme* and the conjugation of *wêze*, *habbe*, *jaen*, *dwaen*, *sjên*, *tsjên*, *sizze*, *lizze*; (3) in vocabulary the use of *antien*, *booskie*, *nioornie*, *tsjoe*, *nanmirs*, *eangje*, *feynt*, *lieppe*, *beppe*, *rieren*, among others. The language shows neither the characteristics of the Hindeloopen dialect in the extreme west (Hl. *wiin* for *wein* 'waggon,' *naernse* for *nioornie*, *laend* for *lân*, *læen*, *ji* for *yo*, *trae* for *trije*, *fréje* for *vræege*, *fan* for *faam*, *jester* for *yster*) nor those of the islands of Terschelling, Schiermonnikoog and Ameland (Schierm. *woin*, *mooi* = *mei*, *laun*, *famde* etc.). As there is no sign of 'Zuidwesthoek' peculiarities either (*hjoei* for *hjoed*), we are perfectly justified in localizing the dialect in the north-west and expressing the view that Titia Brongersma probably learnt it during her childhood at Dokkum.

(p. 156) T'Samen-Spraak,
Toon, La Princes.

Boerin.

Goen dey goen dey Læen Vrouw,
Hier bring ik yo hette aeyen
In twae hinnin uyte kouw,
'K hab se trije wijk in mest
Dir om togt mi wier it best
Dat ik brogt dit tiouke pæer
Ytse op mey ouvvs Læenheer.

The Country-woman.

Good day, ma'am, good day! Here I bring you some eggs and two hens out of the coop. I have had them fattening for three weeks—therefore I thought it would be best for me to bring this plump pair. Eat them up—they are for you and master.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Land-Vrouw.

Trijntie wat is dit geseyt
Siet ik danck u gaat wat sitten
Wel hoe vaart u Man en Meyt,
Sijn u Kinders nog gesont
Wijfvien is dit mee u Hont
Meyden geeft hem dan wat Broodt,
En ik u ter Maaltijt noodt.

Boerin.

Vrœeg i Læen Vrou ney mijn kij
Di beginne al to antien
In mijn man mey nogs wol brij
Maer mijn faam het pijn ijn't lief
Al har Læen bin laem in stief
Yster foel si oof it hæe
Dat ik togt ye bliuwter dæe.

Land-Vrouw.

Neen ik vraag hoe dat het gaat
Met u Kinders Trijntie Iansen,
En u Huys gesontheyt staat,
Gy verstaat mijn taal niet regt,
Sijn dees eyers vers gelegt?
Seeker alsmer wel op let
Sijn dees Hoenders wonder Vet.

Boerin.

Ia ye habbe spijn fort spoon
In de æeyen swiet as moolke
Meytse Io de termin roon
Maer mijn hoes soeyt as ijen souw,
Derom is it so Lœen vrouw,
Dat ik yo nin meer bitins,
In nin tzies of boutir schins.

The Lady (speaking in Dutch).

Trijntie, what is that you say? Well, I thank you. Go and sit down for a bit. How are your husband and your maid? Are your children still in good health? Is that a dog with you, my good woman? Girls, give him some bread and I will invite you to the meal.

The Country-woman.

If you ask after my cows, ma'am—they all show signs of calving. My husband is still fond of his porridge, but my maid has a pain in her body. All her limbs are lame and stiff. Yesterday she fell off the hay-(stack) so that I thought she would die.

The Lady (speaking in Dutch).

No, I ask how things are with your children, Trijntie Jansen, and with the health of your house. You do not understand my talk aright. Are these eggs new laid?—Certainly if one looks at them closely, the fowl are wonderfully plump.

The Country-woman.

Yes, they have fat for the soup spoon—and the eggs, as sweet as milk, will make your belly round. But my butterkeg leaks like a sieve, ma'am. That is why I cannot present you with more and cannot give you any cheese or butter.

[This first conversation is interesting as showing the difficulty a Frisian peasant-woman had in following Dutch, though the 'Land-Vrouw' could understand her Frisian a little better. In line 15 *mijn kij* appears to indicate a misunderstanding of the Dutch *kinders* (11)—cf. the repetition of the question in l. 23—owing to its dissimilarity to the Frisian *bern*.]

Title. The melody known as *La Princesse* is mentioned by van Duyse, *De melodie van het nederlandsch lied* (The Hague, 1902) in discussing on p. 193 the 'Evangelische leeuwerck,' published at Antwerp in 1682, together with La Coquille, La Duchesse, La Royale.

1. *lænvrouw*, 'lady tenant of landed property,' 'wife of a landowner': cf. Dijkstra, *Friesch Woordenboek* s.v. *lânfrou*.

2. *hier*, as in the modern Zuidwesthoek and Hindeloopen dialects in contrast with the commoner 'hjir.'

yo as against *ji* (Hindeloopen).

hette < *hwette*, as in *hett to gappien*, *het biste maal*, a form frequently found in Gysbert Japiks, cf. Epkema's Dictionary, p. 202. English shows an analogous phonetic development in *who*.

3. *in*, more commonly *en*.

uyte < *út de*—spelling influenced by Dutch.

kouw, cf. M.H.G. *kouwe* 'hut above a mine-shaft,' Early N.H.G. *kaue*, M.L.G. *kôje* 'partition,' Du. *kooi*, all from Lat. *cavea* which also yields *käfig*.

4. *in mest*—Dijkstra supplies only the verb *meste*.

6. *tiouke*, Mod. West Frisian *tsjok*, *tsjuk* < Germ. *þekwa-*, *þekwia-*.

15. *i*, cf. Heuser, *Altfriesische Grammatik*, § 43.

Digitized by Google Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

ney, cf. Engl. *nigh*, O.E. *néah*, Go. *néhs*.
kij, pl. of *kóu*.

16. *antien*, cf. Mod. West Fris. *antsje*, Du. 'teekenen,' to show signs of calving, *de kou is yn't antsjen*; cf. further *eand*, *eant*, 'with lamb,' *eandsje*, *inje*, 'to lamb,' Du. dial. *oonen*, O.E. *éanian*, Engl. to *ean*, *yean*. All referred by Franck-van Wijk, *Etym. Wb. der nederl. Taal*, s.v. the unrelated *ooi* 'ewe,' to West Germ. **aunôn*, equated with Welsh *oen*, Ir. *uan*, Lat. *agnus*.

17. *brij*, in a more generalized meaning just as we say someone is 'off his feed.' Sometimes *brij* means a banquet or party.

18. *faam*, 'maid' (in both senses), cf. Icel. *feima*, O. Sax. *fēmea*; Germ. **faim*-(in)- and Walde's *Lateinisches etym. Wb.*, s.v. *opīmus*.

19. *har*, now more commonly *hjar*. Japiks has *her*, *herre*, *jearn*.

20. *foel*, instead of *fell* through contamination by 'fara' class.
oof, both adverb and preposition, e.g. *gean ôf't hynsder* or *fen't hynsder ôf*.

21. *ye*, in the modern texts usually *hja*, but 'h' is often silent in 'hj.'
bliuwter < *bliuwde er*—*bliuwde* side by side with *bleau*; *er* = *der* 'of it.'

24. *huys gesontheyt*, not in the *Algemeen Woordenboek der Ndl. Taal*.

26, 27. *vers* = 'versch'; *alsmer* = 'als men.'

29. *spijn*, 1. 'the pith of wood, layer between the bast and the heart of the trunk,' 2. 'a layer of fat' as in *de kou dêr sit wol spijn op*; *hy hat net folle spijn op'e ribben*; *spek en spijn*. Cf. Franck s.v. *spind* with cognates M.L.G. *spint*, O.H.G. and O.E. *spind*, further *πίων* $\sqrt{spi\check{\imath}}$.

spoon, now commonly used like Ger. *span* for a 'chip,' but the diminutive *spoun'e*, the compound *bûterspaen* and the verbs *spane*, *bûterspane* contain the secondary idea of 'spoon.'

30. *swiet as moolke*, not in Dijkstra, who has *sûkerswiet*. In Modern W. Fris. *swiete môlke* is equivalent to 'full' unskimmed milk.

31. *meytse...roon*. The *Alg. Wb. der Ndl. Taal* quotes from the *Klucht van de saus* the sentence: *ick heb, hoe't gaet, garen, dat den Darm ront staet* s.v. *darm*, vol. III, col. 2298.

32. *hoes*, not in Dijkstra. Franck quotes s.v. *hoos* the N.H.G. *hose* 'pijpvormig vat voor boter' and the *D. Wb.* vol. IV, 2 has s.v. *hose* (col. 1840. 11 b) 'ein hölzernes gefäss, in das butter eingedrückt wird.'

soeyt, apparently for *swit*(et) i.e. 'sweats.'

souwe, *sou*, Du. *zeef*. The interchange between Germ. **sīþ-* and **sīhw* not yet explained.

34. *bitins*, also *bitink*, in the secondary sense 'to present': cf. Du. *bedenken*.

(p. 164) T'Samen spraak.

Toon, Belle iris.

de Boer.

Goen joon boer faem goen Ioon
Heste Ioed' to kæemir weysin?
Ia ik tins forschate reysin
Meye feyntjn æck ijn't roon
Ia ik gis dat sibrigs looskie
Di de knoote het bistioerd'
Tialæ wol in mot æek booskie
Oors lis ik't op hotse sioerd'.

de Meyt.

Ny ik wyt dogs nioornie fin
'K gis i miene Martzins Iantjen
Altijd lis i so to rantjen
Sioeg ik tioeg wol opp' erin.
Hab i oors næet nies to snappien
Haed de toet din nammirs to,
Altijd had i hett to gappien
In ik sis it is nœt so.

The Peasant.

Good evening, lass, good evening! Have you been down to the inn to-day? Yes, I think you've been there several times with fellows round about. I suppose Sibrig's lad has gone and got engaged to you, for Tiala will and must get married, otherwise I would put my money on Hotse Sioerd.

The Girl.

No, I know nothing about it. I suppose you really mean Martsen's John. You lie there talking nonsense all the time. Do I look bad in that matter? If you haven't anything new to gossip about, just hold your tongue. You've always had something to gape at—and I tell you it is not so.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Boer.	The Peasant.
Ey het biste maal in tyoe Soeste der om hinne rinne 'K Læeu de famnin baesig binne As min praet fin Ionge lijoe, Der ye nagts in deys om tinse 'K Læeudu ingiste der oon Woe ouws Ian dy't yld' oors schinse Du betrouwst him dijn pirsoon.	Oh, how foolish and wicked you are to run off there for that purpose.—I think girls get excited when one speaks of young men whom they think of day and night! I believe you're anxious about it and if our John was to make a proposal to you, you would accept him at once.
Meyt.	The Girl.
Imme Ian siougt fiers to Hæeg Hi kin't lieppe aay naet fijnæ, Of hi mot die schoeg op byne Ny'k most æeftir ime wæeg Sok ijen feynt als ijmme Soentje Wijt ik nioor nje ijn ous Læen, Rin riuw hinne mey Ion Kroontje Ik nim Tiale byer Hæen.	Your Jan looks much too high. He can't find the lapwing's egg, unless he laces up his shoes. No, I should have to go to your house. I know no fellow so silly as your son anywhere in this country. You run away with your Jan Kroontje. I shall take Tiale by the hand.

2. *kæemir*, now written *keamer* 1. 'room,' 2. spec. 'the upper room in a village inn, where dances are held' (Dijkstra).

weysin, as mod. *ik hab wêzen* (or *wêst*).

4. *meye feyntjn* = mei'e feinten ; *feint*, 'adolescens,' derived by Franck s.v. *vent* from *veemgenoot*.

æek, now usually *ek*.

5. *looskie* is apparently a diminutive of the adjectival *losk*, *lask*, cf. *in lask minske* 'one living alone' and *in pear laske lûde* 'a childless couple.' *lask* usually means 'light, thin' (Dijkstra).

6. *knoote*, mod. *knotte* 'a knot.' The reference seems to be to the 'knottedoek,' an embroidered handkerchief in which the 'trouwpenning' was offered by the suitor. The 'knottedoaske' was a silver box in which the 'trouwpenning' was kept. *de knotte is fêst* is used for 'they are now engaged.' A further reference to this custom seems to be implied in l. 23 of this poem—it certainly is in verse 3 of *Hotsenan's Vrijerij*.

bistioerd, cf. *bistjûre* 'to fix up, settle,' M.L.G. *besturen* etc.

7. *booskie* < O. Fris. *bostigia*.

8. *lis* I take to be from *lizze* 'to lay, i.e. to put one's money on.' [Tiale is apparently Sibrig's son ; *hotse* is perhaps only a nickname, cf. *hotseman*, while *Sioerd* is from *sigiward*.]

9. *nioornie*, mod. *nearne*, *nearnje*, *nôrnze* (Harich), 'nowhere.'

fin = *fen*, to be construed with *wit*. For position cf. *om* in l. 21.

11. *rantjen*, cf. Dijkstra *rantsje* and Franck's remarks on *ranten*.

12. *tioeg* I take to be a misspelling for *tioe* (cf. l. 17) through contamination by *sioeg*. *tsjoed* means not only 'bad, wicked' but also 'frightened, feeling bad or queer' and the phrase may mean 'do I look frightened or anxious?' in reply to the thinly veiled innuendoes of 6 f. Dutch uses *opzien* in somewhat similar situations, e.g. *tegen iets opzien*, 'to look forward with anxiety to something' or *vreemd, verwonderd opzien*.

13. *nies*, mod. *nijs* 'news.'

snappien. *snappe* can mean 'to chatter' in modern Frisian.

14. *haed* without *l*, cf. *æede* in l. 4 of the last poem.

toet, cf. Franck s.v. *tuit*, Old Dutch *tûte*.

nammirs, 'just, only.'

19. *baesig*, cf. Old Du. *bāsich* 'foolish,' M.L.G. *bēzich* etc., discussed by Franck s.v. *bazelen*.

22. *ingiste*. The modern inf. is *eangje* (but *ea* is pronounced *je*) which is also used impersonally *my eanget*, cf. the last poem l. 18.

23. *woe*, past (subj.) of *wolle*, like *s(c)oe* to *scille*.

oors, mod. *oars*, 'otherwise' as against Du. *anders*.

Digitized by Google Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

25. *imme=jimme* poss.
fiers to, mod. *fiersen-to, fiers-to* 'much too.'
26. *lieppe aay*, mod. *ljipaei*. The lapwing builds its nest as a rule on marshy ground, whence the allusion in l. 27. Under *aeisiker* Dijkstra gives the phrase *in goed aeisiker sjucht oan't fleanen* (flight) *fen'e ljeap hwer't de aeijen lizze*, and cf. the figurative use in *dy fint komt hjir gau ris; hwet scoe dy syn aeisiikjen wêze?* Van Dale states in his dictionary that the *kievitsaei* is considered a great delicacy.
27. *op byne*, 'to tighten,' like Dutch *opbinden* as against German *aufbinden*.
28. Not quite clear. *æeftir ime wæeg* seems to be *efter jimme weach* 'behind your wall.' The Frisian bed is usually let into the wall, whence the phrase *yn'e weach sliepe*.

(p. 166) Hotsemans Vryery.

Toon, Lom'rig woudt.

Wier om wotte mi næet habbe
Sis mijn soucker swiete læem,
Of is Lolkmoers harre Tiabbe
Tho dijn Liæef de mœest biquaam.

Why won't you have me? Say, my sugar-sweet lamb, or is Lolkmoer's Tiabbe the most agreeable to be your sweetheart?

Wotte habbe sil ik stere
Sis ho biste nou so tioe,
Of mot ik eerst vryen lere
Fin ous Boermans jonge lioe.

Will you have me die? Say—how spiteful you are. Or must I first learn how to court from our farmer's young folk?

Sioegste wol di tiouke knote
Sil ik di mijn gouden Iaen
Ister yoen yoeg Sibbils Bote
Mi dit woendre rinkel raen.

Do you see? This big knot I will give you, my sweetheart. Yesterday Sibbel's Bote gave me this wonderful ring.

Dog du dit dijn liæeve Swobbel
Sey er, in ik ron rieuw fort
Maar di liltie rabbel wobbel
Die mi yn mijn dwaan tho kort,

'Give this to your dear Swobbel,' he said, and I ran right off, but the ugly scamp cut me short.

Omye sey: wol motte booskie
Hotse tiene din tho wirk
Oors bitiugt di Tæetse looskie
Of ous Ian mieg, of Piers Dirk.

Uncle said, 'You must indeed get married, Hotse, so get to work, otherwise Tæts' lad or our cousin Jan or Piers Dirk will cut you out.'

Nim mi dogs mijn Swiete Famke,
Siker wier ik bin so ing
Dat der om ous Beppe Ianke
Mey mi kibt dat bose ding.

So do accept me, my sweet maid. Really I am so anxious that our granny Yanke will grumble at me, the spiteful creature.

Wottit dwaan du schette lisse
Moorns oon agt, of nioegen oer,
'K silit yten, lit dy sisse
For di sette op it fioer.

If you will do it, you shall lie in bed till eight or nine o'clock in the morning, and let me tell you, that I will put the meal on the fire for you.

Wotte nogs næet, 'k woe wol gale
Hestit hirt so slagger ijn
Sis reys Iaa, allijk as Tiale
Tiebbis Breyd; di male Trijn.

If you won't even now, I feel like yelling. If you have heard me, shake hands on it. Just say yes—just like Tiale Tiebbi's bride, mad Trijn.

Lit oes æek as oore minschin
Swobbeltie, ey you min pat
Dir's nin græeter lok tho winschin
Wes so goed ik bid di dat.

Let us be as other folk, Swobbeltie, now give me a kiss. There's no greater happiness to be desired. Do please, I ask you.

Wotte næet, du meystit litte
'K vræeg nin meer, koens baauk wol wol,
Ey het minst du honne tijette
Wey, mey di du tirrel hol.

If you won't, you needn't! I shan't ask you any more, Koen's Baauk will have me. Eh, what do you think of that, you spiteful huzzy?—Away with you, you shrew!

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

[The 'toon' *Lom'rig woudt* looks like a translation of the French 'en l'ombre d'ung buisonnet,' cf. Gaston Paris, *Chansons du* XV^e^ *siècle*.]

3. *Lolkmoers harre*—possession expressed by both inflexion and possessive pronoun as in German and English, e.g. *dem Vater sein Haus, the king his book* etc.

5. *wotte habbe sil ik*, lit. 'wilt thou have shall I....'

10. *mijn gouden*, a term of endearment as in G. Japiks.
jaen, past *joech* (11), like *slaen* : *sloech*.

12. *raen*, Ger. *Rand*.

13. *dog*, imperative of *dwaen* 'to do, also to give.'

14. *sey*, past tense of *sizze*, like *ley* of *lizze* 'to lay.'
rieuw, now spelt *rjû* 'very much, a great deal, frequently.'

15. *liltie—lilts* is now given as a poetical or literary form for *lilk*, Du. *leelijk* 'ugly.'
rabbel wobbel—rabbelje 'to gossip, speak ill of.' *wobbel* may be a proper noun.

16. *die...to kort*, cf. *Deutsches Wörterbuch*, v, col. 2830 s.v. *kurz* II, 5.

18. *tiene*, apparently imperative of *tsjen*, Ger. *ziehen*.
din=den 'then.'

19. *bitiugt*, apparently from *bitsjén*, but the meaning is not certain.

20. *miich*, Du. *maag* etc. 'a kinsman,' used in compounds like *Jolle-miich*.

24. *kibt*, cf. Franck s.v. *kibbelen*, cognate with Ger. *keifen*.

26. *moorns*, cf. *nachts en deys* (II, l. 21).
oon agt, cf. *it is ticht oan tsienen* 'just on ten.'

29. *gale*, now *gâlje* 'to howl, weep,' frequent in Japiks (Dijkstra).

30. *slagger ijn*, apparently equivalent to Ger. *einschlagen* 'to strike a bargain,' though Dijkstra does not supply this meaning s.v. *ynslaen*.

31. *reys*, used like mod. *ris*, derived by Dijkstra from *er is* (Du. *er eens*), or a stereotyped adverbial form of *reis* 'a journey.' It occurs in a similar context in the next poem l. 19 and by G. Japiks who also employs the plural *reysen* 'times.'

34. *ey you min pat=ei! jow mi'n pat. pat* for 'kiss' quoted by Dijkstra from the Frisian periodical *Iduna* alone.

39. *minst*, 2nd pers. sing. of *miene*.
honne, hoanne, still used of an ill-natured girl or woman.
tsjitte, only given now as a verb. In English we have *chit* as a substantive.

40. *tirrel hol*. Wumkes and de Vries, *Nederlandsch-Friesch Woordenboek* translate the Dutch 'kijven' by *tsjiere*, though this is not in Dijkstra, who supplies *tsjierderij*. *hol* I take to be *hol*(*le*) 'head,' here used in a compound as in Ger. *Dickkopf, Schafskopf* etc.

(p. 192) Toon : La (*sic*) Cardinal.

Sibrig sis wier rinste sey
Bring ous de ky vinne ickers mey
Maar lit de kæelin rinne : maer lit,
Driuw de æede Ruyn
Ynne kaemp by de tuyn
Inne rieren ijnne finne.

Sibrig, say, where are you running off to, pray? Bring us the cows from the fields with you, but let the calves run—let them. Drive the old gelding into the paddock by the garden and the heifers into the fen.

Sioeg reys ijnne Jarre slæet
Of daar de tourle leyt of næet?
Du moste fiouwir meltie : du moste :
De oore sex of agt
Nim ik din wol to wagt,
Of sist læer oon ouws Jeltie.

Just look at the 'groop' (dunghill drain) to see whether the milking stool is lying there or not. You must milk four, you must. I will then take charge of the other six or eight—or you'd better tell our Jeltje to do so.

Rop dat Dirk in swetse man
Dè bry poot bringt in drinkins kan
In reuwe din twae weynnin : in reuwe.
Fird ijmme hette fort
Di tied valt oors to kort :
Mi engit joed for reynin.

Shout for Dirkjen the chatterbox to bring the porringer and drinking can. Then harness two waggons, harness them. You just make haste, otherwise the time will be too short. I fear we shall have rain to-day.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Harck reys joo eer ik't forijt
Dat swetse di den menne lit
Du kinste best di herne : du kinste :
Finne schoere door
Du witstit for ijen oor
Maar gied for al ous tierne.
Flye jouwir ijnne hoek
Du wistit wol eij spoed di kloek
Ik mot it ijt in kootse : ik mot it :
Rep ijm hette tel
Ouws boete komt meij snel
Nu mot ik't flaaks eerst plootse.

Just you listen before I forget. 'Swetse' must let you do the driving. You know best where the dairy is—you can tell it from the barn door. You know it properly. Above all pour the liquor off from our churn.

Put some oats in the corner—you know where I mean—now, be quick. I must cook the meal, I must. Get along with you quick, for here comes our Boete with Snel and now I must first pluck the flax.

1. *sey*, an interjection as in *wolst nou ophâlde, sei!*, really an imperative of *sizze*.

3. *kælin* = *kealen*.

4. *ruyn*, cognate with Swab. *raun*, M.L.G. and Old Du. *rûne*, Finnish *ruuna*, cf. Kluge, *Etym. Wb.* s.v. *Wallach*.

5. *kaemp*, 'campus, ager' as in *in kamp greide*, and cf. Schiller-Lübben, *Mittelniederdeutsches Wb.* vol. 2, p. 423.

6. *rier*, n. 'a heifer or 1½ years old cow' apparently going back to a Germanic **hrinþiz-* (Old Frisian *hrither*) in 'ablaut' to **hrunþiz*, whence O.E. *hryðer*.

7. *jarre slaet*, cf. Du. *giersloot*, the first constituent appearing in Japiks as *jerre*, O. Fris. *iere, gere* 'stale, liquid manure, N.H.G. Jauche,' M.H.G. *gerwe* etc. < Germanic **garwiôn*, cf. Falk and Torp, *Wortschatz der Germ. Spracheinheit*, p. 128. *slaet* (O. Fris. *slât* 'a ditch'), cognate with Mod. Ger. *schlot*, M.H.G. *slât*, which Kluge doubtfully connects with M.H.G. *slâte*, 'a reed.' Franck s.v. *sloot* derives it from *slaut* + *sliutan* 'to shut.'

8. *tourle* I take to be the same as Mod. West Frisian *toelle, tulle* in which *r* has been assimilated to the following *l*. It is tempting to associate the word with M.H.G. *twirel*, O.H.G. *dwiril*, O.E. *þwirel* and O.N. *þvara* 'a churn-staff,' all from a base **þwer-*. Milking stools usually have round tops. Cf. further Falk-Torp, *Norw. dänisches Etym. Wb.* s.v. *tull, tvare*.

12. *sist* = *sis it*.

lær = *learre* 'potius,' used by Japiks.

13. *Dirk in swetse man*, perhaps for *Dirkien swetseman*. *swetse* means 'to boast, talk big' and appears in *swetsersbaes, swetshals, swetshans*. Cognate with N.H.G. *schwatzen*.

14. *drinkins kan*, cf. *drinkens-kop, -potsje, -wetter*.

15. *in reuwe* I take to be a verb meaning 'to inspan,' derived from the substantive *reau* 'horse and cart.'

16. *fird ijmme*, imperative of *firdgje, firdde* as in *ick môt my ney huws to firdgje* (Japiks).

hette = *hwette*, used adverbially.

fort, mod. *foart* 'immediately; off.'

20 ff. The sense is not absolutely clear. *menne* can signify 'to drive' or 'to cart hay or grain or manure'; *herne* also means 'a piece of ground.'

23. *for ijen oor* = *foar in-oar*, Du. 'in orde, geregeld.'

25. *flye*, used by Japiks. Cf. O. Sax. *giflîhan*, Du. *vlten*, Franck s.v. *vlijen*.

jouwir—Japiks *jouwer* < *hjouwer*, Du. *haver*.

27. *it ijt in* = *it yten*.

kootse, mod. *koaitsje* 'to cook,' cf. *plootse, ploaitsje* 'to pluck.'

28. *rep ijm*. Kiliaen books *reppen* 'movere etc.' as a Frisian word; cf. O. Fris. *hreppa*, O.E. *hrepian*, and Franck s.v. *reppen*.

tel, adv. as in Japiks. Dijkstra gives the meanings 'dra, vlug, snel' in *klaei dy tel*. Japiks uses *tel* as an adjective for 'busy,' perhaps cognate with Go. *gatils*, O.E. *til* 'efficient,' O. Fris. *til* 'good.'

29. *boete* is given as a name in Winckler's *Naamlijst*, p. 43, but W. Fris. also has a common noun *bût*, Du. 'jong kameraad' used vocatively.

snel I have also taken as a name, as Dijkstra does not give *snel* either as adjective or noun, and there is an Old Fris. name *Snello*.

LIVERPOOL. W. E. COLLINSON.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES.

On 'Some Fourteenth Century Borrowings from Ancren Riwle.'

In my article of the above title in the *Modern Language Review*, Vol. XVIII, p. 7, I wrote: 'The *Ancren Riwle*, or a common-place book quoting from it, has evidently contributed the following to the *English Psalter* of Richard Rolle of Hampole: "Oure tonge is in wate, forthi lightly it slippis, as we doe when we ga in sklither way" (p. 142).' I should, before hazarding this statement, have consulted the *Commentary on the Psalter* of Peter the Lombard, which is so often the source of Rolle's *English Psalter*. Under the commentary for Ps. 38. 1, where Rolle uses the sentence in question, we find in the Lombard: 'Non enim frustra est lingua in udo, quia facile labitur' (Migne, *PC*, 191, *c.* 389). This is quoted from St Augustine, who is doubtless the source of the *Ancren Riwle* at this point. The appearance of the same passage in both *Psalter* and treatise, therefore, means nothing for the relation of the two works.

Hope Emily Allen.

London.

Three Notes on the Middle-English 'Cleanness.'

I.

599. *to draw allyt.* I attempted in Vol. XIII of this *Review* to explain this rare and curious idiom by reference to the union of *draw* and *dryȝe* in M.E., with the consequent identification of their meanings. Prof. Gollancz, who has taken me to task in this *Review* (XIV), explains, without producing any data, that *draw* means 'delay,' and that *allyt*, 'a little,' in effect means 'not at all.' Commenting on the passage, Prof. Emerson (*P.M.L.A.* XXXIV), whilst mainly agreeing with Gollancz, points out rightly that the phrase is antithetical to *drepeȝ in haste* in the second half-line. I must admit the error of my former note, whilst contending that here is an idiom not hitherto accounted for. Emerson, Gollancz and Knigge have erred with me in mistaking *allyt* for *a lyt*; whilst the glossing 'delay' for the whole phrase is correct only in a loose and general way. Indeed it is possible, though unlikely, that *dryȝe* means 'delay,' as it does in the phrase *dreigh to draw* (see *E.D.D.* under

Digitized by Google

Original from
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

draw); and that *dryȝe to draw allyt* means 'delay, stop to turn aside' (see below).

In his attractive edition of *Purity* (*Yale Studies in English*), Mr R. J. Menner has anticipated the suggestion I wish to make. As Mr Menner however produces no data[1] (see his brief notes, l. 599), I beg to submit what to me seems indubitable evidence that *allyt* means 'in delay, unto delay,' hence 'aside.'

The word *draw*, in the first place, never signifies 'delay' without some particularising adverbial phrase. In the few citations given by *N.E.D.* under *draw*, IV, 55, the word literally means 'protract,' but never 'delay' without further modification. The crux of the matter therefore with regard to the present idiom is the word or phrase *allyt*.

Strikingly similar is the idiom *to draw on lyte*, unrecorded in *N.E.D.* or elsewhere, though there is an unquestionable instance at *Sir Gawayne & the Grene Knight* 1463:

& mony arȝed þerat & on lyte drozen.

Fortunately there is no doubt, I think, of the meaning of *on lyte*; no possibility of identifying it with *a lyte* 'a little.' The evidence which seems decisive to me occurs in the *Catholicon Anglicum* (*E.E.T.S.* 1881, p. 107). There is recorded the idiom *draw on longe* or *on lenght*, 'crastinare, prolongare.' According to a footnote, however, the MS. has *on lyte*, which the editor has corrected to *on longe* from the A MS.; an unfortunate correction. Thus we get *on lyte* as equivalent to *on longe* in the idiom to *draw on long*, 'crastinare.'

With *on* a preposition, there is no doubt that *lyte* is the same word as *lett, lytt, lyte*, 'delay.' The idiom *to draw on length* is thus defined by reference to *lyte*, *Religious Pieces* (*E.E.T.S.* XXVI, p. 13):

Latesomnes or lyte, to draw apon lenghte.

A synonymous idiom, noted by the dictionaries though somewhat scantily, is *to draw on dregh* (*Morte Arthure* 3968, *Le Morte Arthur* 2826, *Wars of Alexander* 11647 and *Sir Gawayne* 1031); also a variant, *withdrew one drege*, *Morte Arthur* 4219. Thus we get the idioms *draw on lyte, draw on long, draw on length, draw on dregh*. *lyte*, 'delay,' according to *N.E.D.* occurs generally in the phrase *without lite*, but it seems clear that *on lyte* should be recognised by lexicographers.

[1] I do not mean to belittle Mr Menner's note: he supports his interpretation by citing *Sir Gaw.* 1463. The *presumptive* evidence so far, however, is that *on lyte* in this passage means 'a little,' because *lyte* 'delays' seems to occur almost exclusively in the phrase *with(out) lyte*; and *on lyte* generally in the sense of 'a little.' My purpose here is to establish the idiom *draw on lyte* and to show it glossed in M.E. as *draw on length*. Menner's other citation, *on lyte lette*, is more than doubtful: *lyte* 'delay' here would involve a curious tautology.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

It is more than likely that the *allyt* of *Cleanness* is a form of *on lyte* with proclitic *a-*. Firstly, *lyt* would thus form an antithesis with *haste*. Moreover, although no other *allyt* is recorded, the analogous forms *droȝ adreȝ* (*Cleanness* 71) and *draw along* (*N.E.D.* under *draw* VII, 77) do occur, and the conceivable and likely variant of *on lyte* would be *allyt*, not *alyt*. The spelling is probably an attempt to distinguish from *a lyt*; otherwise the scribe would not have doubled the consonant, as *l* is doubled frequently in these poems in a compound after a short vowel (see Knigge, p. 60). Had the scribe intended *a lyt*, he would merely have attached the *a*, arbitrarily, to the following word. In this way I would justify Prof. Gollancz's statement—quite unsupported by evidence—that 'the spelling is intentional.' *draw allyt* means literally 'protract into delay.' (For *allyt* see also *Beiträge*, IX, p. 365.)

Nevertheless there remains one passage in which the meaning of *draw* and *lytte* is not easy to determine. In the alliterative *Morte Arthure* 550 we read:

> I rede þow dresche the þerfore, and drawe no lytte langere.

Editors have glossed *lytte* 'little' and have left *draw* unexplained, though obviously it could then mean nothing else but 'delay.' There is however here no evidence for assuming an idiom *draw a lytte*, with the above as the negated form: even if we accept *lytte* 'little,' we can only infer an idiom *draw langer*. In the absence of any record of *draw* 'delay' (literally), we may translate, 'and draw out no longer delay.' *let* and *longer* are frequently found in association: *but* (= without) *langer let*, Barber's *Bruce*, II, 179, *letted na langer*, *Alex.* 801, *na lang lite*, *Cursor Mundi* 5790 [*no* of course may be an error for *ne* or *no* = 'not,' cp. *Le Morte Arthur* 37].

Of the four idioms mentioned in this note, two are certainly of French origin; the other two perhaps modelled on French. Littré under *tirer* 21 records *tirer en longueur* 'prolonger,' and under 43 *tirer de long*, 'apporter des délais dans une affaire.' Under *délai* occurs the idiom *mettre en délai* (English *to set* or *put in delay*), and the quotation there given, with *délai* in antithesis to *haster*, recalls a little the line in *Cleanness*.

II.

Hyphenation and Compound Words.

Dr Menner often shows a reluctance to admit compounds and hyphenated words into his text. Such caution is perhaps commendable, and indeed he is less conservative in this matter than most editors and lexicographers. I cannot however agree that editors of the alliterative

Digitized by Google Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

poems are justified in their fear of the hyphen. It is better to err in favour of the spoken word than in favour of the script. The *N.E.D.* shows little consistency in its admission of compound words from the alliterative poems or elsewhere, and appears to adopt them from glossaries without examining how far they are due to the caprice of the editor. Thus the *herbisyde* of 916 is undoubtedly genuine as recognised by the *Dictionary*, but there is quite as much reason for reading *her-utter* at 927 (O.E. *hērūt*). The *N.E.D.* countenances Morris's *rayne-rifte* of 368 and *samen-feres* of 985, but *þunor-þrast* of 952, as accepted by Menner, is quite as justifiable (cp. *thunder-thump*, etc.).

It is an admitted difficulty to decide whether two words have coalesced into one integral word in M.E., and a dissertation on this subject would be of sterling value to editors. Yet there are so many words which scribes write frequently as compounds, that it is astonishing to find editors slavishly following the text whenever the same words are written *divisim*. At l. 1619 the sense seems to demand *as-swyþe* 'immediately,' which is supported by M.E. and modern dialect *aswithe*. I should not hesitate to print *wel-nyȝe* at 704 and 1422 (see *Sir Gaw.* 7), and would even consider *wel-ner* at 1585. In l. 216 we must either translate literally, or hyphenate *tyþe-dool*, 'a small part,' cp. *Sir Gaw.* 719 (M.E. *tithedeal*). To these I would add *oþer-whyle* at *Patience* 120, as frequently in *Piers Plowman*, though the word is printed *divisim* both in Gollancz's edition and mine. At l. 1453 *s[eve]n-ȝere* seems almost a compound, though in view of the MS. I am inclined to read *sen-ȝere* (cp. *senȝere & more*, *Octovian* 1386, c. 1400), or even *sevȝere* (cp. *Moral Ode* 146, *Wa wurð sorȝe seveȝer*). At 1192 *two-ȝere* (cp. *twaȝere* in *Cath. Ang.*) is possible but very doubtful; it is more likely at *Pearl* 483.

Reluctance to hyphenate is especially noticeable with the noun-epithet which tends to integrate by frequency of association with the following noun. Menner accepts Emerson's proposal of *schroude-hous* 1076 (which however should be glossed 'tiring-house,' cp. O.E. *hrægel-hūs*), but rejects *clenelayk* 1053, which has a formidable list of analogous forms in *-leik* to support it. In l. 28 (where there is no alliterating letter for the second half-line), I suspect another instance of the noun epithet which requires hyphenation with the following word. Scribal mistakes between *h*, *b* and *l* are not uncommon in the MS., and I propose to read *love* for *bone*:

For he schal loke on oure Lorde wyth a love-chere

(cp. M.E. *love-dreme*, *love-eye*, *love-late*, and *luf-laȝyng* and *luk-talkyng* in *Sir Gaw.*). The nouns of relationship are difficult to deal with. Some-

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

times *moderson* and *sisterson* are written as integral words in M.E., though in the *Cath. Ang. syster sone* etc. are written *divisim*. Probably the uninflective genitive tended to integration of the spoken words. Emerson suggests *modor-chylde* at 1303, and *syre-son* would be possible at 1299.

The chief difficulty arises from O.E. compounds which appear to be undergoing disintegration in M.E. Alliterative verse would certainly retain such archaic compounds long after they had disintegrated in colloquial speech, and the evidence of the MS. is valueless, as the scribe divides even indisputable compounds. Compounds not essentially proper to poetic diction would most readily lose their power of cohesion. I should for instance hesitate to read *Hyȝe-tyde* (O.E. *hēahtīd*) 'festival' at *Sir Gaw.* 932. There are cases where the poet might choose between regarding two words as compounded or disintegrated as rhythm demanded. Thus we might print *seven-syþe* at 1188 (O.E. *seofonsīþa*; cp. also 1417), but at 1686 the plural form suggests separate words. It is generally held that O.E. *hēahweg* and *hēahstrǣt* had undergone disintegration. The words are always printed *divisim* in *Piers Plowman*, where they occur very frequently, although *h* is generally the alliterating letter. If we accept the current view of these forms, analogy will lead us to reject *grete-streetez* for 77, by which the poet translates the Vulgate *plateas*, as also does Wycliffe; and the form is more suspect by Wycliffe's translation of *vicos civitatis* by 'small streetes of the city.'

On the other hand, there are a number of poetical designations of God, interesting relics of O.E. poetry, which in alliterative verse at least I do not hesitate to regard as compounds; for I assume that the verse-rhythm would have kept them cemented. One of them, *Hevenkyng*, is indeed printed as an integral word in Menner. I would also add *Hyȝe-kyng* at 50, *Heȝe-kyng* at *Sir Gaw.* 1038 and at *Piers Plowman* B, XV, 539 (O.E. *Hēahcyning*). Worthy of consideration also is *Hyȝe-God* 1162 and *Pearl* 1054, *þe Hyȝe-Godez self* (O.E. *HēahGod*). I grant that the same word should be read and written *divisim*, as the editors have invariably printed it, at *Clerk's Tale* 206. Metre seems to demand it: 'Bot hyè God some timè sendan can.' A southern poet, however, writing in alien verse forms, would inherit nothing from the traditions of O.E. verse. At 542 probably we should read *Hyȝe-fader* (O.E. *Hēahfæder* 'Patriarch, God'), cp. *God Hehfaderr*, Ormin 17107.

There are lastly the disputed or disputable cases of compound verbs with *to-*. Three passages are here considered. Two have already received the attention of scholars, who apparently would rather attribute *gaucherie*

Digitized by Google Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

to the poet than acknowledge the presence of verbal compounds in his vocabulary.

In *Sir Gaw.* 478–480 I would read:

> & hit watz don abof þe dece on doser to henge,
> þer alle men for mervayl myȝt on hit loke,
> & bi trwe tytel þer-of to-telle þe wonder.

The normal sequence of thought expects in l. 480 a simple infinitive cognate with *loke*, and *tōtellan* is good O.E. Translate, 'and by sure token thereof relate the marvel.' It is quite true that by straining rules of proximity a translation can be found without resort to hyphenation: 'and it was placed above the daïs to hang on the back of the seat—where all men might gaze on it as a curio—and by sure token (of its actually being there) to testify the strange incident.'

A similar suggestion of mine for *Clean.* 54 was questioned by Gollancz and accepted by Emerson:

> And sende his sonde þen to say þat þay samne schulde,
> And in comly quoyntis to-com to his feste.

Also in *Peres the Ploughman's Crede* 8 we should read *to-comen*, where again hyphenation makes considerable difference to syntax.

Moreover, few I think will agree with Gollancz in dismissing Osgood's reading of *to-even* at *Pearl* 1073:

> & to-even wyth þat worþy lyȝt.

Gollancz would read the passages from *Clean.* and *Pearl* as examples of the infinitive of purpose. In the *Clean.* passage, again, the attribution of a tantalising ellipsis of expression to the poet will relieve the demand for hyphenation. A comma after *quoyntis* would indicate that *to com* modified *And* (*samne*) *in comly quoyntis*: translate, 'They should assemble, and (do so) in their finest attire, (in order) to come to his feast.' Surely this wrenching and straining is undesirable when we know that all three verbs under dispute occur in O.E., and two in M.E., as compounds with *to-*, and also that in these poems undoubted compounds with *to* are always written *divisim* in the MS. A kind of M.E. ghost-syntax has materialised from the failure to recognise these verbal compounds.

III.

Lines 982–3.

In Vol. XIII of this *Review* I called attention to four instances of a rare use of the redundant *ne* in the *Alliterative Poems*, and ventured a partial explanation which Emerson and Menner subsequently endorsed. I would add a passage from Trevisa (*Polychronicon*, ed. Lumby 1876, Vol. VI, p. 387). This instance is not quite parallel with any of the uses hitherto noted, i.e. (1) after *ere*, (2) with *þat* after a comparison of in-

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

equality and (3) after verbs of fearing as noted by Einenkel (*Anglia*, XXXV, 222 f.), but it shows in its use of *þat...ne* a close resemblance to *Clean.* 983, and is more valuable than the others because it translates literally the Latin of Higden. We read that Arnulphus was afflicted with sickness, 'and myȝte nouȝt be i-heled noþer i-saved wiþ no manere medecyne, þat he nas destroyed.' The unknown translator of the fifteenth century (Harleian MS.) has simply, 'cowthe not have helpe by eny medicyne but he was consumede.' Now Trevisa's *þat...ne* is his translation of Higden's *quin*: 'Tandem longa infirmitate decoctus nulla medicina potuit curari quin a pediculis consumeretur.' Thus we have an opportunity of deciding how Trevisa regarded the force of *þat...ne*. As in Latin, *þat* has a significance derived from an original ablative: Arnulphus could not be saved by any healing by which (or 'so that') he did not die; and the lingering of Lot's wife was not a lingering so that (or 'by which') she was not turned to stone.

OLDHAM. HARTLEY BATESON.

A MINOR SOURCE OF 'THE CHANGELING.'

In Middleton and Rowley's *The Changeling*, acted at least as early as January 4, 1623–4, the main plot was based on John Reynolds's *The Triumphs of God's Revenge against...Murther* (1621, Book 1); though the psychology of de Flores and Beatrice-Joanna and the swift, fierce, passionate action of course belong wholly to the dramatists, for the protagonists in History 4 of *God's Revenge* are mere shadows.

But Reynolds's book contains no mention of certain striking incidents in the main plot of the play, viz.:

(1) The substitution of the waiting-woman for Beatrice-Joanna in the latter's bridal bed (this is unnecessary, for in Reynolds's story Beatrice is still a virgin at her marriage);

(2) The setting on fire of the house to prevent the immediate discovery of the subterfuge;

(3) The murder of the waiting-woman (Diaphanta) to ensure her silence in the matter.

It has not yet been noticed, I believe, that these three important points, and some minor ones, were in all probability borrowed from Leonard Digges's novel *Gerardo the Unfortunate Spaniard* (London, 1622), translated from the Spanish of G. de Cespedes y Meneses, which appears to have become pretty popular. It was only entered on the Stationers' Register on March 11, 1621–2, but was quickly drawn upon by contemporary dramatists (Fletcher, Massinger, etc.) for the

Digitized by Google Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

plots of their plays (e.g. *The Spanish Curate*, licensed October 24, 1622, and *The Maid in the Mill*, licensed August 29, 1623).

In Gonçalo de Cespedes's novel, Isadaura, a ravished lady, persuades her waiting-maid ('secretary to my inmost thoughts') to take her place in her newly-wedded husband's bed ('preparing her to make good my defect with the integretie of her honesty, which I nothing doubted but was entire'). Isadaura—who, like Beatrice in the play, is all the while in love with her unsuspecting husband—relates, that, finding the maid had forgotten her promise and fallen asleep, 'My rage increased the more when (hearing the Clocke strike three) I saw little memory in her of my danger.' Thereupon, desperate, she sets the house on fire, wakes her husband, and in the confusion all rush out of the room together; but Isadaura, now jealous of her maid, and deeming her too shallow for a safe secret-keeper, murders her by pushing her into a well. Owing to the fire and the consequent uproar, her secret remains undiscovered.

This series of events the authors of *The Changeling* appear to have adapted to their plot, and very cleverly interwoven with the original story related in *God's Revenge*. It has been suggested[1] that the incidents in question were taken by the dramatists from some (hypothetical) derivative of an old French story with a similar plot. But the proximity of the dates of Digges's *Gerardo* and *The Changeling* (1622 and 1623 respectively) combined with the above-mentioned similarities of incident renders this, to say the least, unlikely. The ultimate source of the Cespedes-Digges story of Isadaura was no doubt the *Gesta Romanorum*, for in that great collection, as Karl Christ has pointed out[2], there is a tale containing the rough outline of that in the novel.

LONDON. BERTRAM LLOYD.

'SCAMELS' IN 'THE TEMPEST.'

There are probably few words in Shakespeare's plays that have more exercised the ingenuity of commentators than the 'Scamels' which figure among Caliban's promised offerings to Stephano in *The Tempest* (Act II, Sc. ii). Of the many conjectural meanings and readings, ranging from Chamois and Squirrels to Limpets and Samphire, two alone—both originally suggested by the acute Theobald—can be said to hold the field at the present day, viz. *Stannels* (or Staniels) and *Seamells* (or Sea Malls). Theobald pointed out (1733) that both these 'come near to Scamels in the Traces of the letters'; and Mr Dover Wilson, in the new

[1] By G. P. Baker in *Journal of Comp. Lit.* (Vol. I, New York, 1903) citing Legrand D'Aussy: *Fabliaux ou Contes* (ed. 1829). The date of the original French story is not given.
[2] *Quellenstudien zu den Dramen Middletons* (Leipzig, 1905).

Digitized by Google Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Cambridge University edition of Shakespeare, remarks that 'palæographically there is nothing to choose between the two,' though on other grounds he prefers the latter—a preference which is doubtless shared by most students of Elizabethan ornithology and literature. The following passage from Richard Carew's *The Survey of Cornwall* (ed. 1602, London, leaf 35), which I believe has not hitherto been cited in this connexion[1], seems to me to offer further support for the reading 'Seamells.' After mentioning various coast birds such as 'Meawes,' 'Murres,' 'Burranets,' 'Creysers[2],' etc., Carew writes:

> These content not the stomacke all with a like sauoriness, but some are good to be eaten while they are young but nothing toothsome, as they grow elder. The Guls, Pewets [i.e. Blackheaded Gulls], and most of the residue breed in little desert Islands, bordering on both coastes, laying their egges on the grasse, without making any nests, from whence the owner of the land causeth the young ones to be fetched about Whitsontide for the first broode, and some weeks after for the second. Some one but not euerie such Rocke may yield yeerely towards thirtie dozen of Guls.

Here we may note:

(1) The rough differentiation of the various species of Gulls, etc., as 'Meawes,' 'Guls,' 'Pewets,' and so forth; remembering that even to-day our own poets are usually delightfully vague about the species of 'Seamew' or 'Seagull' whose praises they sing.

(2) The 'desert Islands' and (particularly) the 'Rocke,' from which the *young* birds were sometimes fetched.

'Sometimes I'le get thee young Scamels from the Rocke,' says Caliban; and we know that young gulls or seamews were considered very palatable in Elizabethan England. Dyce wrote that 'the words "from the Rocke" would seem to be equivalent to "from the cliffs,"' pinning his faith to the reading 'Staniel' largely owing to the fact that Kestrels often nest 'in rocky situations and high cliffs on the coast.' He also remarked that the absence of the second 'l' in 'Scamel' rendered it less likely to be a misprint for Seamell or Seamall. This point however is probably of scant importance, just as is the absence of the second 'l' in 'Guls' in the passage from Carew's *Survey* cited above. It may be added that William Strachey in his oft-quoted letter of July 15, 1610, descriptive of the Bermudas (*A true reportorie of the wracke, etc.*) refers to 'our men...standing on the *Rockes* or Sands by the Sea side' to capture the so-called 'Sea Owles' (presumably Shearwaters), birds 'of the bignesse of an English greene Plover or *Sea-Meawe*.' And it is at least quite probable that Shakespeare drew upon Strachey for some of the local colour in *The Tempest*.

LONDON. BERTRAM LLOYD.

[1] Except in an ornithological journal (*British Birds*, March 1923), where I drew attention to it in a letter discussing the suggestion that Scamels were Sheld-Ducks.

[2] Probably Kestrels.

Digitized by Google Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

REVIEWS.

An Anglo-Saxon Verse-Book. By W. J. SEDGEFIELD. Manchester: University of Manchester Press; London: Longmans, Green and Co. viii + 248 pp. 9*s.* 6*d.*

Professor Sedgefield's *Anglo-Saxon Verse-Book* will be welcomed not only as the work of a scholar who has given us reason to expect a high standard of achievement in all his studies in Anglo-Saxon, but also as one of the first volumes of selections in which the emphasis has been laid on the literary rather than on the philological value of Old English. The editor tells us in his Preface that the *Anglo-Saxon Verse-Book* 'is an anthology in which the most representative and original parts of our earliest poetic literature are brought together. The selections are arranged in accordance with their literary affinities, the idea of an organic whole being throughout emphasised.'

Dr Sedgefield has cast his net far and wide, and the wealth and variety of his haul will be apparent from a description of the contents. The book consists of five sections: I. *Germanic Legend and Story*, including selections from *Beowulf*, *Widsith*, *Waldhere*, *Deor*, and the *Lay of Finnsburh*; II. *Elegiac, Lyric and Moralizing*, including, *inter alia*, *Wolf and Eadwacer*, *A Woman's Complaint*, *The Fates of Men*, *The Husband's Message*, and *A Bad Character* (*Der Menschen Gemüt*, Grein-Wülker, III, pp. 144–5); III. *Narrative and Descriptive*, including selections from *Beowulf*, practically the whole of the *Exodus*, and two brief extracts from the *Christ* and the *Elene*; IV. *Biblical and Christian*: and V. *Miscellaneous*, including extracts from the gnomic and didactic poetry, the *Riddles*, and the *Rhyme Poem*.

It will be generally admitted that Professor Sedgefield has produced an anthology well calculated to bring out the literary qualities of OE. literature, and to illustrate the life and thought of the heroic and Anglo-Saxon periods. Doubtless the editor had good reason for the omission, but we cannot help regretting the absence of *The Dream of the Rood* from the selection. Not the least among the merits of the book is the clearness with which it shows the composite *literary* character of *Beowulf*.

The introductions to the selections are adequate and are supplemented with bibliographical information in the notes, which are concise but apposite. There is a complete glossary, an index of persons and places, and a useful appendix on Anglo-Saxon versification. The book is published at a price which puts it within the reach of students of limited means.

I add a number of notes on the texts, some of which Professor Sedgefield might perhaps take into consideration in a second edition.

Digitized by Google

Original from
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Beowulf.

þēodgestrēonum þon(ne) þā dydon. (p. 12, l. 44.)

The insertion of *ne* is scarcely necessary. Compare

thoncsnottura than him tharf sīe. (*Bede's Death-Song.*)

bi sǣm twēonum.
(p. 14, l. 116. Also *Exodus*, p. 97, l. 449.)

Professor Sedgefield remarks (p. 145): 'The two seas are the Baltic and the North Sea, so that the expression means the countries between these seas, the homes of the Angles, Danes, etc.,' and (*Exodus*, 449) '*be sǣm twēonum* is a phrase which occurs four times in *Beowulf*, where it means "by the two seas," i.e. where the North Sea and the Baltic meet. In the present poem (*Exodus*) it is possible that the words refer to the Red Sea and the Mediterranean, but they may be used in a general sense, "in the world."' In the reviewer's opinion, the latter is the only possible sense. Surely *bi sǣm twēonum* is a case of tmesis and means, in the first place, 'between the seas' or rather 'amid the seas,' and thence 'in the world.' Professor Sedgefield would not translate the phrase *be werum twēonum* (*Andreas*, 558) 'by the two men'? As most of the northern peoples lived in insular countries, it is easy to see how 'amid the seas' became synonymous with 'in the world,' 'on earth.' The same point of view is apparent in

Faraþ nū geond ealle eorðan scēatas
emne swā wīde swa wæter bebūgeð (*Andreas*, 332–3)

which is merely a paraphrase of 'Euntes ergo docete omnes gentes.' (Mark xxviii, 19.) [Cf. Streitberg, *Gotisches Elementarb.*[4] § 195.]

Finnsburh.

ymbe hyne gōdra fæla
hwearflicra hrǣw. (p. 27, ll. 34–5.)

For this I venture to suggest *hwearflicra hrǣs*, taking *hwearflicra* as equivalent to *hweorflicra* from *hweorflic*, 'transient,' 'short-lived,' which occurs for example in *Boethius* (Fox, p. 32, last line): 'Hu ne is hit þær swiþe sweotol hu hweorflice þas woruldsælþa sint?' *Hrǣs* would be equivalent to *hrēas*, so that the meaning would be: 'Around him fell many a brave man, doomed to an early death.' On the whole, a verb seems to suit the context better than a noun.

The Husband's Message, 64–5.

gif hē þīn benēah
ofer eald gebēot incer twēga.

Dr Sedgefield translates: 'if only he has thee to crown the vows ye once exchanged.' No doubt this is the sense required, but can *ofer* bear it? If we take *ofer* = 'after' (cf. *ofer eald gewinn*, *Beowulf*, 1782), we may translate: 'if he has thee after the vows ye two have exchanged.'

The Fates of Men, 50–3.

Sum sceal on bēore þurh byreles hond,
meodugāl mæcga, þonne hē gemet ne con
gemearcian his mūðe mōde sīne.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

'When he is unable with his mind to impose restraint upon his mouth.' (Sedgefield.) I would propose to put a comma after *con*, and to take the passage as parallel with passages like *Beowulf*, 154–6 and 1432, i.e. variation of a noun with an infinitive phrase, the former being general in its meaning, the latter specific, and translate: 'He knows no moderation, to put restraint upon his language (mouth) with his mind (or perhaps better "in his anger or pride").'

Exodus, 63–134.

It is to be presumed that Professor Sedgefield has duly weighed and rejected the late Professor A. S. Napier's brilliant suggestion (*M. L. R.*, VI, April, 1911) that the confused arrangement and disorder of this passage are due to the displacement of ll. 86–107 and ll. 108–124, 'probably caused by the wrong folding of a couple of leaves in the MS. from which Junius XL was copied or at any rate descended.' Professor Napier's rearrangement, which is entirely convincing, gives the events in their correct sequence.

Nearwe genȳddon on norðwegas. (*Ex.* 68.)

On this passage Professor Sedgefield remarks, '*Genȳddon*, "pressed on," understand *hīe* as *nīedan* is transitive. *nearwe* = "with difficulty."' It seems to me much better to take *nearwe* as subject and to translate, 'Difficulties forced them northwards.'

gesāwon randwigan rihte strǣte
segn ofer swēton oð þæt sǣfæsten,
landes æt ende, lēodmægne forstōd,
fūs on forðweg.' (*Ex.* 126–9.)

'The shield-fighters saw the road straight before them; the banner (i.e. the pillar of fire) eager to advance, high over the hosts, helped the army right up to the sea-fortress (i.e. the shore) at the land's end.' (Sedgefield, p. 178.) Surely the obvious meaning is rather: 'The shield-fighters saw the road straight in front of them, the banner, eager to advance, high over the troops, until the sea, where the land ended, blocked the way of the host' (or if we emend *fūs on forðweg* to *fūson forðweg*, with A. S. Napier, we get an even better sense: 'until the sea (fastness) at the end of the land blocked the further journey of the host, the eager (troop)').

oð þæt wlance forscēaf
mihtig engel, sē ðā menigeo behēold,
þæt þǣr gelāðe mid him leng ne mihton
gesēon tōsomne, sīð wæs gedæled.
Hæfde nȳdfara nihtlangne fyrst,
þēah ðe him on healfa gehwām hettend seomedon,
mægen oððe merestrēam; nāhton māran hwyrft.
(*Ex.* 204–10.)

Professor Sedgefield comments on this passage as follows: '206–7. *þæt.....tosomne*, "so that the foemen could not see among themselves any longer," i.e. they were covered with a mist. *sīð wæs gedǣled*, "their course was interrupted." 208 ff. "Compelled to march, they (the Is-

Digitized by Google Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

raelites) spent the period of night, though foes lurked on every side, either the (hostile) force or the sea." It looks as if the poet had intended to provide an object for *hæfde*, but began the sentence afresh with *nāhton*.'

Let us now see what the Vulgate says. It reads: 'Tollensque se angelus Dei qui praecedebat castra Israel, abiit post eos: et cum eo pariter columna nubis, priora dimittens, post tergum stetit, inter castra Aegyptiorum et castra Israel, ita ut ad se invicem toto noctis tempore accedere non valerent.' (*Exodus*, xiv, 19–20.) From this it may be inferred that (1) *sē ðā menigeo behēold* = 'praecedebat castra Israel,' and means, 'who protected the host (of the Israelites)'; (2) *þæt þǣr gelāðe mid him leng ne mihton/gesēon tōsomne* = 'ita ut ad se invicem toto noctis tempore accedere non valerent,' i.e. 'that the foes (Egyptians and Israelites, since *gelāðe* is reciprocal) could no longer see one another'; (3) *sīð wæs gedǣled* does not mean, 'their course was interrupted,' but rather 'their march was separated,' i.e. the Egyptians and the Israelites were not able to see one another because their line of march was separated by the pillar of cloud. I should like to get rid of the difficulty about finding an object for *hæfde* by reading *nȳdfare* (acc.) and supplying *menigeo* (205) as subject: 'It (the host of the Israelites) had to march all night long, though' etc.

The Ways of Creation, 43–5.

Ides sceal dyrne cræfte,
fǣmne hire frēond gesēcean, gif hēo nelle on folce geþēon
þæt hī man bēagum gebicge.

Professor Sedgefield notes that this passage is not clear, but he translates it: 'a woman, if she cares not for her reputation among the people (i.e. for public opinion), seeks out her friend(s) secretly, to sell herself for rings.' This can hardly stand. There can be little doubt that *þæt hī man bēagum gebicge* is equivalent to 'to get married.' Even the Virgin Mary is represented as having been 'bought' by Joseph, in the *Heliand*:

Tho ward hugi Josepes,
is mod gidrobid, the im er thea magað habda,
thea idis andhetia, aðal-knosles wif,
giboht im te brudiu. (295–8.)

I should translate: 'A woman, a virgin, will visit her lover secretly, if she be unwilling to succeed in getting married,' or perhaps better, with Professor Mawer, 'A woman will find a lover by sorcery, if she does not succeed in getting married.' In the first instance, the meaning would be ironical, but on the whole I prefer the second.

A Father's Advice, 183–6.

Dō ā þætte duge, dēag þīn gewyrht;
God þē bið symle gōda gehwylces
frēa ond fultum, fēond þām ōþrum
wyrsan gewyrhta.

'Do ever what is good...the enemy (i.e. the devil) is the worker of

Digitized by Google Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

harm to the other' (i.e. the bad man). (Sedgefield.) Is the meaning not rather: 'Do ever what is good, and thy deserts will be good. God will be ever thy protector and support in all good things, (but will be) a foe to the other (i.e. the bad man) who is inferior in deserts'? (Cf. Psalm xxxiv, vv. 15–6.)

Riddles, LV, 9.

þær wæs hlin ond āc.

According to Hoops, *Waldbäume*, p. 232, *hlin* ought to be *hlīn* with long *ī*. (Hoops quotes O.H.G. *līmboum*, and Maced. Gk γλεῖνος, as well as the Russ. *Klënŭ*.) There does not seem to be much doubt about the meaning 'maple,' though Sedgefield queries it in the Glossary.

Varia.

Exodus, 491.

Sisam's suggestion (*MLN.* XXXII, 48) that *-benn* in *wælbenn* is a byform of *bend*, 'bond,' is worthy of note. Sisam (*l.c.*) also mentions that A. S. Napier read *wi(þer)trod* for *witrod* and rendered 'God's handiwork (the sea) fell upon their way of retreat.'

With reference to *Exodus*, 505 and 575, it may be noted that Bright doubts the existence of a verb *scēon* = 'happen,' and refers *gescēod* (505) and *scēode* (575) to (*ge*)*scēadan*. [*MLN.* XVII, 426.]

ealuscerpen (*Beowulf*, 769).

Dr Sedgefield's emendation of *ealuscerwen* to *ealuscerpen* was suggested, he tells us, by the 'MS. reading in the similar passage in *Andreas* (1526).' The facsimile of the Vercelli Codex, however, shows *scerwen* and not *scerpen* in *Andreas*.

S. J. CRAWFORD.

SOUTHAMPTON.

The Works of Shakespeare. Edited for the Syndics of the Cambridge University Press by Sir A. QUILLER-COUCH and J. DOVER WILSON. Vol. III. *The Merry Wives of Windsor.* xl + 149 pp. 1921. 8*s.* Vol. IV. *Measure for Measure.* xliv + 176 pp. 1922. 7*s.* Vol. V. *The Comedy of Errors.* xxiv + 127 pp. 1922. 6*s.* Vol. VI. *Much Ado About Nothing.* xxix + 174 pp. 1923. 6*s.* Foolscap 8vo. Cambridge: University Press.

The first two volumes of this new edition of Shakespeare, containing *The Tempest* and *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, were reviewed by Dr Greg in *The Modern Language Review* for April 1922, with a wealth of detail, especially as regards the textual treatment of *The Tempest*, which I have unfortunately neither the space nor the competence to emulate. The new volumes follow the same general lines, with the exception that for *Merry Wives* the editors have to take account of a 'bad' Quarto and for *Much Ado* of a 'good' Quarto, as well as the Folio. Mr Wilson's speculations on the textual histories of the four plays briefly

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

amount to this. The copy for the Quarto of *Merry Wives* consisted partly of an abridged playhouse version (probably in the form of players' parts) of an old play which had not yet been brought by revision into its final shape, and partly of additions made thereunto by the pirate-actor who was responsible for the surreptitious publication. The Folio text represents a revised version, but was also 'assembled' by stringing together players' parts with the aid of a theatrical 'plot' of the play. *Measure for Measure* is based upon a text which has been first abridged for a performance at court, and afterwards expanded, also from players' parts, by a prose adapter who was not Shakespeare. *Comedy of Errors* has a more elaborate pedigree still. Shakespeare revised an old play, possibly identical with the *History of Error* given by the Paul's boys in 1577 and the *History of Ferrar* (which I should take to be *Ferrara*) given by Sussex's men in 1583. He preserved a structure primarily adopted for an unchanged classical setting at court, and some at least of the original doggerel. His text is lost, and the Folio has that of an abridgment made for travelling purposes in the playhouse by two distinct scribes, one of whom worked with the help of dictation from players' parts, while the other added stage-directions from memories of the old play. The Quarto of *Much Ado* was printed from a prompt-book, probably in Shakespeare's handwriting; the Folio from the same prompt-book or from a copy of the Quarto, containing some later alterations made for theatrical purposes. But here also Shakespeare was working upon an older play, perhaps of his own, and retained bits of the older text. He worked carelessly, and the names of the actors Kemp and Cowley occur in the speech-headings to iv, 2, because he could not remember that the constables were called Dogberry and Verges.

Obviously there are theories here that cannot be accepted without minute and searching scrutiny. I am sceptical about the transference of a playbook from Paul's to the Chamberlain's, especially if it passed through Sussex's, at a date when Paul's were still in full activity; and about the assumed practice of abridgment, either for travelling, or for court performances, which are not known to have been shorter than those in the public theatres. I am still more sceptical about the recurrent suggestion of 'assembled' plays. How was it that so many sets of parts came to be preserved without the prompt-copies to which they belonged? Would not almost any librarian have tied up prompt-copy and parts together, so that they would have been lost or burnt together? Or is it supposed that they were left in the hands of individual actors, and yet were all forthcoming when they were wanted? Mr Wilson thinks that a 'clean' text points to the use of parts, because in them 'the irregularities and obscurities of the prompt-copy would be smoothed out' and would not give rise to 'misprints,' incorrect verse-lining and similar phenomena. But surely the condition of the only 'part' we know, that of Orlando, does not bear him out. And surely the process of 'assembling' would itself be a tedious and difficult one. 'Plots,' if the Globe book-keeper used 'plots,' might show the order of

Digitized by Google

Original from
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

entries, but would not show the succession of speakers. The Orlando cues do not indicate their speakers, and I should certainly expect, in a text so constructed, to find errors traceable to a wrong dove-tailing of the cut-up speeches, as well as others due to the incorporation by the printers of cues left uncancelled in error.

I have only room for two specific points of stage-history. Mr Wilson attempts to confirm the date of 26 December, 1604 (which I do not doubt) for a court performance of *Measure for Measure*, and incidentally to support an ingenious textual emendation, by explaining the words 'these black masques Proclaim an enshelled (*for* enshield) beauty' as a reference to the forthcoming *Masque of Blackness* on Twelfth Night, 6 January (not, as he says, 5 January!), 1605, in which the masquers represented the daughters of Niger and entered in a concave shell. No doubt they did, but, as it happens, they did not wear masks. Dudley Carleton tells us that 'instead of vizzards, their faces and arms up to the elbows were painted black,' and in another letter that it was 'a very lothsome sight.' In the second point I have myself an interest. The *Gesta Grayorum* record a performance of *Comedy of Errors* at Gray's Inn on the night of 28 December, 1594, presumably by the Chamberlain's men. But the *Chamber Accounts* show the Chamberlain's men as playing on the same 28 December before the queen at Greenwich. I suggested that this was an error for 27 December, assuming, no doubt, that the Greenwich performance was also 'at night.' 'But,' says Sir A. Quiller-Couch, 'Mrs C. Carmichael Stopes had already shown, and has recently reminded us, that the assumption is worse than unnecessary: that instead of the usual form On Innocents' Day at night, this particular entry has On Innocents' Day. So we are still free to believe that our players, having enacted *Errors* before the Queen in the afternoon, returned in time to present it before the lawyers in the evening.' I am not quite clear how any hypothesis can be 'worse than unnecessary,' but I am quite clear that Mrs Stopes has 'shown' no such thing. The variation of form, of which there are other examples in the *Chamber Accounts*, means nothing whatever. The words 'at night,' although usually recited by the accountant from the original warrant before him, were immaterial to the auditors. This is not a mere assertion. I cannot control the actual entry in the *Chamber Accounts* for 1594, because the *Revels Accounts* for that year are not extant. But, if Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch will look up the parallel records, say for the winter of 1579–80, he will find that the *Revels Accounts* often supply the words 'at night,' where the *Chamber Accounts* have omitted them. I do not propose to assert categorically that no Elizabethan Christmas play was ever given in the afternoon, but a fairly exhaustive review of the annals has not brought to light any evidence for such an occasion. Part of the fun of collaboration is that you can sometimes play off one editor against another. Mr Wilson is much too cautious to eat out of Mrs Stopes's hand, like his colleague. He uses the discrepancy of dates to support his theory that there existed two versions of *Comedy of Errors*, 'for if there were two prompt-books, the company of base and common

Digitized by Google

Original from
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

fellows which performed at Gray's Inn was not necessarily the same troupe that acted at Greenwich.' Both editors, it will be observed, 'assume' that, if the Chamberlain's men were at Greenwich on 28 December 1594, they were playing *Comedy of Errors* there. For this, of course, there is not a scrap of evidence.

E. K. CHAMBERS.

LONDON.

The Jonson Allusion-Book, a Collection of Allusions to Ben Jonson from 1597 to 1700. By JESSE FRANKLIN BRADLEY and JOSEPH QUINCY ADAMS. (*Cornell Studies in English.*) New Haven: Yale University Press; London: H. Milford. 1922. vi + 466 pp. 25*s.*

The Preface informs us that the major credit of collecting and transcribing passages alluding to Jonson belongs to Mr Bradley, and that later Mr Adams 'assumed specifically the responsibility of editing the material for the reader.' The editors, we are told, are not vain enough to suppose that they have been able to collect all the important references to Jonson. We have however to thank them for a book which covers a wide field and throws much light on the course of seventeenth-century opinion with regard not only to Jonson but to many of his contemporaries. In the details of execution the work hardly reaches the standard of scholarly accuracy which the names of its editors would lead us to expect.

A reviewer cannot be expected to collate every passage in a book of this kind with its source—even if the source is within his reach. He must be content to make a certain number of collations and to take the part as a sample of the whole. The result in this instance has been at times disquieting.

The most glaring examples of slipshod work have been pointed out to me by Mr Percy Simpson.

On p. 262 a passage from Herrick's poem, *The Apparition of his Mistresse calling him to Elizium*, appears as 'Anonymous, before 1640' (quoted from *Poems: written by Wil. Shake-speare* 1640). The text given differs much from that of the *Hesperides* and contains some obvious errors, e.g. 'enrage' for 'engage,' 'joy' for 'ivy,' as has been pointed out by Professor Moorman. On p. 141 under 'Thomas May, 1629' we have lines addressed to Ford: 'Tis said from Shakspeare's mine your play you drew,' and on p. 189 under 'Endymion Porter, before 1635' other lines on Jonson and Randolph: 'Quoth Ben to Tom, the Lovers stole, 'Tis Shakespeare's every word.'

Both these poems are quoted from Malone's *Shakespeare*, 1821, where they are followed by an Excursus in which Malone shows that both were forgeries (as is apparent at a glance) written by the actor Macklin to puff a revival of Ford's *Lover's Melancholy* in 1748. Yet our editors give the poems as authentic on the very authority which has condemned them.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Among less serious points calling for consideration are the following:

p. 29. W. I. *muleis nimium* ?multis nimium.
p. 56. E. Bolton 1607, *Præbrebit for* Præbebit (orig. Prebebit)
J. Donne 1607, Amicessimo *for* Amicissimo
Omnes *for* O omnes
parennitatem *for* perennitatem
ut te *for* ut et
} So, at least, in the *Workes* of 1616.
p. 59. I. C. 1607, 'may be Sir John Cleveland' (corrected in the Errata to 'may be John Cleveland'). The poet John Cleveland was born in 1613.
p. 75. *Accounts* 1611. The Roman numeration has been misunderstood and is so printed as to be unintelligible. It should have been seen that 80 (or lxxx) is here expressed by iiij^{xx} (=four score).
deyser *for* devyser.
p. 78, bot., the readers *for* thy readers.
p. 79. Fletcher, Or the new Lexicon. Or *not in the original edition.*
p. 80. N. Field, thoroughly *for* throughly.
p. 94. A. Holland, Defuncta ?Defunctae.
p. 96. Selden 1616, Efflictum *for* Efflictim.
E. Hayward (?Heyward), Whose fame is that of height *for* Whose frame is of that height.
p. 119. Oxford Register, nominea ?nomine a.
H. Fitzgeoffrey, Gownis *for* Gowries.
p. 137. R. James, faile *for* saile.
Anncients *for* Auncients.
characted *for* charactred.
p. 138. invehunter *for* invehuntur.
innocuous *for* innocuos.
fera for sera.
p. 142. J. Webbe, multiciplicitie, MS. multiplicitie.
w'm, MS. w^{m}.
suffice, MS. suffice you.
p. 144. T. Randolph, Claim thee and say [that]. The insertion is not needed.
p. 150. Anon. (4 lines from bot.), else ?elfe.
p. 169. Visc. Falkland, ege *for* ego.
Thou of thy Mistresse. For 'Mistresse' 'Master' seems required.
p. 172. Anon. Fealtie, Fealty *passim for* Featlie, Featly.
p. 173. T. Randolph, New with wax *for* Never with wax.
p. 174. wins from them *for* wins with them.
p. 178, top, A. Gill, push ?plush.
p. 190. J. Howell, *reglo for regalo.*
p. 197. Anon., l. 13, Thou (so in *Wit Restor'd*) ?Though.
p. 238, l. 15 from bot., work *for* works.
p. 244, l. 2 from bot., press *for* dress.
p. 247. Wortley's Latin epitaph is printed very incorrectly in *Jonsonus Virbius.* The date in Roman numerals is still incorrect here. It should be CIↃ CI CXXXVII or MDCXXXVII. It is not clear what is to be made of 'Id. Nonar,' if it means the date of Jonson's death, 6th August. If it means the date of the composition of the epitaph, it may stand for 'Id. Ianuar,' or 'Id. Nouem.'
Terrent, l. 6, restringuit (so in the original) *for* restinguit.
l. 11, Deliquum *for* Deliquium.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

p. 249, l. 13, conjurat æque *for* conjuratæque.
p. 255. Anon. Most, but not all, of the Greek words have lost their accents.
p. 265. Hodgson, enthreat *for* entheat.
loaded *for* loaden.
p. 279, l. 12, wine muses ?nine muses.
p. 304. Gayton, Construpation (so in Gayton) *for* Constupration.
p. 305, top, sedde *for* sed de.
bot., Gayton's title is *Pleasant Notes*, though the running title is *Festivous Notes*.
p. 309. *The Hectors*, l. 3, the *Browns for* and *Browns*.
We now know that the lines *On the Time-poets* were written by William Hemminge about 1632. See J. J. Parry, *Journal of English and Comparative Philology*, XIX (1920), p. 270, or W. Hemminge, *Elegy on Randolph's Finger*, edited by myself. The text too may now be improved.
p. 311. Anon., l. 7, fine new *for* 'fire new' as Ebsworth suggested.
p. 313. Bellasye, *tenua ? tenuia*.
p. 324. Kirkman, A comma required after 'Was blest with.'
p. 338. Anon., about 1668. Reappears p. 359 under '— Watson 1670.
p. 382. Duport 1676. Duport was born 1606 and the lines were certainly written in Jonson's lifetime.
p. 408. Evelyn. In Tate's collection these are stanzas 5, 6, 8, 7 of Evelyn's poem. Why is Evelyn's order here changed ?
Evelyn, l. 5, cur'd *for* aw'd.
p. 409. ——, l. 10, live *for* Thrive.
p. 449. Brown 1699, nuperical *for* numerical (*so in edns of* 1720, 1744).

The editors have often modernized the spelling and punctuation of the text from which they quote, but they do not seem to have followed a consistent plan.

G. C. MOORE SMITH.

SHEFFIELD.

William Wordsworth; his Doctrine and Art. By A. BEATTY. University of Wisconsin Publications, No. 17. Madison: Wisconsin, 1922. 284 pp. $2.

The literature department of the University of Wisconsin has distinguished itself by a series of studies of modern poetry marked by a severity of historic method, and a deliberate detachment from aesthetic criteria whether of matter or of style, which have not been usual in this country. The early life of Wordsworth still offers scope for such treatment. M. Legouis's famous book gave a notable impulse to research in this field, but he was far from exhausting it. For his illuminating survey of *The Prelude* still left important questions to be asked about that development of Wordsworth's mind which the poet had the air of expounding at such unexampled and even inordinate length; and the transparent sincerity of the exposition discourages at the outset any attempt to read between the lines anything not implicit in what they

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

contain. On the other hand, Wordsworth's natural reticence largely deprives us of those spontaneous evidences of the ways of his thinking which flash out continually from the letters and talk of Coleridge. Even the momentous 'crisis' which ended with his 'recovery' at Racedown and Alfoxden, to which so many eloquent and splendid pages of the later books of *The Prelude* are devoted, leaves many lacunas. He tells us at length of the healing influence of his sister. But, as Professor Beatty pertinently remarks, 'however great and important the influence of Dorothy was upon him, it cannot have been in the direction of furnishing the poet with a philosophy and an aesthetic. And yet, during this crucial period of his life, he was furnished with both; so the problem of the critic is to cast about in search of the source whence Wordsworth drew his inspiration and his knowledge.' Put in a word, Professor Beatty's thesis is that Wordsworth's 'source,' in this sense, was the philosophy of David Hartley, the stimulating but second-rate thinker who for some years captured the whole-hearted allegiance of Coleridge, and is known to have been warmly admired by Wordsworth himself.

Much of the difficulty of Wordsworth's thought—and Professor Beatty rightly insists that it is difficult—lies in his apparent endorsement of radically different attitudes in different poems equally authentic. The doctrine of *Expostulation* and *Tables Turned* seems to be the pure sensationism of open eye and ear, the 'wise passivity' of eager senses from which the intrusively analytic intellect is sternly warned off. Yet in *Tintern Abbey*, at the close of this very volume, the mere animal life of the senses is contrasted, as an immature phase, with the activity of a mind aware of 'something far more deeply interfused' in Nature, and of the 'still sad music' of the life of Man. Hence, too, the facility with which a host of critics—a declared 'Wordsworthian' Arnold at their head—have dismissed his 'philosophy' altogether, while finding felicitous phrases for the 'bare, sheer, penetrating power' of his style. Arnold, to be sure, if we may trust his imagery, did not give Wordsworth all the credit when he wrote thus. 'Nature' took the pen and wrote for him; but if she did, nothing is more certain than that 'philosophy,' Wordsworth's philosophy, looked on approvingly and understood perfectly what the poet was at. In other words, his style was as firmly grounded in his aesthetic theories as his doctrine of 'Reason,' which the Nature-poet is supposed to have so gravely disparaged, or 'Imagination,' whose beacon-light saved him, so far as he was saved, from shipwreck on the shoals of Naturalism.

Now the explanation of these apparent inconsistencies lies partly in our neglect of the fact that Wordsworth's thinking underwent an evolution, clearly as this is laid down in the very structure of *Tintern Abbey*; partly in our yet more marked neglect of the fact that Wordsworth thought and wrote throughout in terms of a psychology which is not ours. It is Mr Beatty's originality to have for the first time made thoroughgoing use of these two facts for the explanation of Wordsworth. He shows how the distinction in *Tintern Abbey* between Wordsworth's period of 'childhood' with its 'glad animal movements,' 'youth' with

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

its 'dizzy raptures,' and 'maturity' with its less vivid sensations but richer and more comprehensive thought, was not merely a piece of autobiography, but a doctrine of the growth of mind in general. But, clearly as Wordsworth felt the distinctness of the successive phases, he was still more profoundly possessed by their unity.

Not merely did the individual soul persist through all the changes from childhood to manhood, but childhood was in some sense the key to maturity, the 'base' on which all its 'honours' were built, the 'father' of whom it was born and bred. This, it is clear from *The Prelude*, was the most profound fact of his inner experience, and it colours all his thinking and teaching about the ways of the soul. As the 'child' is never completely superseded, but contributes something to the building up of all later experience, so, with Wordsworth, 'sensation,' in childhood still 'untouched by solemn thought,' remains a vital factor in all the higher mental and spiritual processes. If the 'glad animal movements' of the child's sense life go by, the quality of sensation which fastens directly upon the object and faithfully mirrors it, remains vital for Wordsworth to all the highest use of mind. He is not attacking reason but a perverse substitution of abstract analysis for thought based upon direct vision, when he uses that cavalier language to the 'dissecting intellect' of science as he took it to be. And 'Imagination,' the supreme faculty with Wordsworth, still bears the mark of that fidelity to fact of which 'sensation' was the type; with all its power of modifying and 'creating,' it was sharply distinguished by Wordsworth from the wanton vagaries and self-pleasing utopias of 'Fancy,' by a stern but profound truth to experience, drawing from the senses 'the very rudiments of its power.'

Now to the part played by sensation in Wordsworth's psychology Mr Beatty finds an analogue, and something more, in Hartley's system, where sensation is the material out of which mind and its contents are built up. And notwithstanding Wordsworth's reticence, he is able to trace decisive correspondences in thought and phrase, which leave no doubt that Hartley provided at least much of the verbal and intellectual apparatus by which Wordsworth rendered articulate intuitions fundamentally original and his own.

But of course that is not the whole matter. Mr Beatty himself is the last to represent Wordsworth's doctrine as 'Hartley' transcribed. 'Wordsworth found the Hartley house brick and he left it marble,' he says, and he points out divergences which amount to much more than this. Especially, he points out how Wordsworth 'places very much more importance on the activity of the mind' in the process of mental growth. And it is hard not to see in Wordsworth's magnificent tributes to the Mind of Man, the haunt and the main region of his song, with its unfathomed depths, and imperial creative power, a conception which threatens not merely to glorify the façade of the Hartleian house, but to plant a new and lordlier palace in the very heart of it. It may be quite accurate to say, with Mr Beatty, that the great lines in the *Ode* which describe

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

> Those shadowy recollections,
> Which, be they what they may,
> Are yet the fountain light of all our day,
> Are yet a master light of all our seeing,

'do not go beyond the warrant of Hartley.' Still, Wordsworth would hardly have called in Plato here, had Hartley's 'warrant' been sufficient. And we do not see why Mr Beatty should dismiss so peremptorily Mr Bradley's proposal to interpret Wordsworth's thought in its higher reaches by German rather than by English philosophic precedent. Mr Bradley did not mean that the idealism of Kant or Schelling in any sense 'inspired' Wordsworth's; Wordsworth's inspiration came from his own awestruck vision of the unfathomable mind of Man. But no English thinker provided any help whatever in interpreting this vision (even if they furnished a 'warrant' for interpreting it) in comparison—far removed as they are by the scholastic habit of their minds from Wordsworth's Naturalism—with the German idealists.

Mr Beatty draws from his general argument some conclusions of great importance, which we can only briefly notice. He regards Wordsworth's poetry of Nature as a subordinate phase, transitional to his poetry of Man—confessedly 'the haunt and the main region of' his 'song.' Still, it is notorious how far he was from carrying out to the full the sublime program laid down in *The Recluse*. In that very passage he enlarges with hardly less glowing eloquence upon Beauty; that living presence of the earth was to be his hourly neighbour. And with what passion, in the closing stanza of the great *Ode*, after dwelling on all the 'consolations' for the loss of the old splendour of Earth, that 'spring out of human suffering,' he turns to the meadows, hills and groves, and bids them 'forebode not any severing of our loves.' Even if the mind of Man was his chief 'haunt,' he notoriously 'averted his ken' from half, or more than half, of its compass, and the passion of the Nature-lover remained unexhausted till the end. At the same time, it is clear that the whole group of 'patriotic' poems, the *Ode to Duty*, and the tract on the *Convention of Cintra* (some sentences of which belong, surely, to Wordsworth's grandest poetry), find a more organic place in Wordsworth's evolution, as Mr Beatty presents it, than in any which starts with conceiving him as fundamentally a 'poet of Nature.'

There is much valuable criticism of particular poems. The analysis of *The Prelude* is of course fundamental, and it is by no means forestalled by M. Legouis; while that of *The Excursion*, in particular of its crucial section, 'Despondency Corrected,' receives added value from comparison with Wordsworth's *Letter to Mathetes*, in *The Friend*, which Mr Beatty is the first to have seriously studied in this connexion. We at times miss a reference to facts of which Mr Beatty is of course well aware, and which seem too relevant to be ignored. In discussing *We are Seven* he quotes the Fenwick note where Wordsworth, in old age, speaks of the opening stanza as his own, and as expressing the teaching he meant the poem to convey. But the evidence seems clear that it was Coleridge's impromptu contribution, and that this charming summary represented

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Wordsworth's thought as little as his style. Mr Beatty is satisfied to explain it as illustrating simply the 'glad animal movement' which fits in so well with his category of childhood, and this was clearly Coleridge's impression when he threw off the summary.

But it is hard to believe that Wordsworth had no further purpose than this in a poem upon which he set so exceptional a value ('I shall keep that, anyhow,' he replied in effect to the friend who pleaded for the rejection of so superlatively silly a piece); or that this little Maid is introduced merely as an example of 'self-concentration and insensibility,' and not as uttering unconsciously the wisdom, utterly beyond her, from which Wordsworthian childhood, whatever its 'animal gladness,' is almost never wholly exempt.

C. H. Herford.

Manchester.

F. S. Shears, *Recherches sur les Prépositions dans la Prose du Moyen Français (XIV^e et XV^e Siècle)*. Paris: Ed. Champion. 1922. 238 pp.

There is much work still to be done in Historical French Syntax. Circumstances have delayed the appearance of the promised fifth volume of M. Nyrop's *Grammaire Historique*, and M. Brunot's monumental works deal with much beside syntax. M. Foulet's *Petite Syntaxe de l'Ancien Français* is exceedingly useful to supplement the older books of Darmesteter and others, but detailed studies of particular points and epochs are still needed. The syntax of isolated prepositions has been dealt with in various dissertations, such as those of F. Michael, G. Raithel, R. Reyelt, etc., but there has been little examination of the causes underlying the changes of meaning and of use, such for example as brought about the elimination of *par* and the adoption of *pendant* to express duration of time. Dr Shears in his thesis seeks for the general tendencies that lie at the root of such changes. He adopts as the basis of the classification of his researches, not the prepositions themselves, but the ideas which different prepositions and prepositional phrases have expressed at different epochs. If this plan inevitably involves some overlapping and repetition, it yet seems the most logical way of dealing with material collected from many sources with a view to tracing evolution in meaning. The formal study of language has been revolutionized in recent years by the works of M. Brunot, M. Vendryès and others. Grammar has shared in the general current of modern thought which substitutes the study of movements for that of states. *La Pensée et la Langue*, which has been called 'the most original work in French Grammar since the eighteenth century,' suggests doubt, at any rate provisional doubt, rather than dogmatism, in dealing with the living language; avoiding rigorous classification the author shows how neighbouring compartments may overlap, how an end may become a cause, a place may pass into an aim, and so forth. As M. Thibaudet has said, a linguistic method which seeks to have any psychological value

Digitized by Google

Original from
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

must now follow the tracks of thought faithfully, and sacrifice clear-cut divisions in the interests of the fluid nature of truth. Dr Shears reveals himself a true disciple of the school which seeks to seize thought thus on the wing in all its complexity and subtlety, to understand rather than to label. Limiting himself for the most part to prose writers of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, he observes in the first place that the extension of sense due to the progress of abstract thought reaches its culminating point during this period; prepositions appear to have their widest meaning about the year 1400, the evolution having been so spontaneous that the same word sometimes shows two entirely contrary meanings, although the various steps of the transition have been perfectly logical. The case is quoted of *contre*, with its double sense of conformity (contrefaire) and non-conformity (contre nature), and we might add *devers*, with its two opposite meanings, 'in the direction of' and 'from the direction of.'

The looseness and weakening due to the wide extension of sense led to a gradual limitation in the interests of precision, and Middle French sees in the next place considerable restrictions and change in the meanings attached to certain prepositions, together with the rejection of superfluous synonyms such as those (*o, atout*) which were used at the beginning of the period for the more modern *avec*. Elimination however was slow, and was retarded by the retention of archaic words in prose versions of earlier poetic works, and in dialectal writings. Some new creations, *à cause de, au prix de, moyennant, nonobstant*, also date from this period.

Dr Shears does not as a rule discuss etymologies, but there are various observations on the Hebraisms due to Biblical language and the forms of the Vulgate: 'croire *en*,' 'servir *en* grant liesse,' '*de* certain,' and also the instrumental use of *en*, as in 'governer *en* verges.' I venture to think however that the examples given on p. 131 do not all illustrate the use of *en* to introduce the instrument, for example, '*en* basse voix luy dit' would seem to indicate manner rather than instrument.

Among many passages which might be quoted, the treatment of the following points appears to me to call for special notice:

The confusion between *a* and *en*, *au* (a le) and *ou* (en le), *as* and *es*, resulting in such expressions as '*en* mon nom et *au* sien,' '*au* mois de mars' but '*en* mars,' '*au* printemps' but '*en* hiver,' etc., and in the growing use of *dans*, which is little known in Old French, or indeed before 1450: the weakening in value of *a* and *de*, as representatives both of the Latin dative and ablative, and of the prepositions *ad* and *de*, resulting in the increasing use of *pour*: the occasional use in Middle French of the old genitive by juxtaposition ('fille la comtesse') for the objective genitive ('la prise son cousin'), a use never found in Old French: the explanation of *de*, *que*, and *que de*, in such expressions as 'si j'étais *de* vous,' 'peu de chose *qu'*une pomme,' 'misères *que de* nous'; and a similar theory as regards *de par* (p. 142): the confusion (partly phonetic) of *par* and *pour*, leading to the anomaly in the parallel expressions '*pour*quoi' and '*par*ce que': the absolute constructions, chiefly

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

participial, *durant, vu, passé, présent* (is this always absolute or a real preposition, = 'in the presence of'?), but also including *malgré*: the instrumental use of *avec* (p. 128), which appears to be extremely rare before 1400; few examples are found in Froissart's first version (1360), while they are numerous in the third version (1400): the copulative use of *parmi* (p. 202).

In a work of this description it is difficult to be at all complete and at the same time to avoid the commonplace, and undoubtedly all has not yet been said on the subject of the Middle French prepositions. The following points in particular seem to be capable of some amplification. Page 46. The old substantive *vis* is said to be preserved only in the expression *vis-à-vis*. Is not the modern *avis* the survival of the old prepositional phrase 'mest a vis'? Page 176. 'Selonc ta miséricorde,' 'selon sa grand repentance,' etc., are given as examples of the causal use of *selon*, whereas they seem rather to belong to the category of conformity. Page 188. The use of *sur* in comparisons is said to be limited nowadays to the expressions '*sur*tout,' '*sur* toutes choses.' Does not 'quinze *sur* vingt' belong to the same category? Page 209 has a note on the use of *de* instead of the conjunction *que* after a comparative, representing the Latin use of the ablative in such expressions as *grandior Petro*. The example given, 'elle en a trop de plus de la moitié,' is somewhat misleading, with its double *de*, but the point is worth making.

The index has been very carefully compiled and will be found of great service for the study of individual prepositions. The table of contents shows clearly the classification of the chapters already alluded to, according to which prepositional uses are arranged under the headings of place, time, instrument, manner, cause, and so forth. The conclusions are well summarized in the final chapter. The thesis is a distinct contribution to the study of semantics as well as of historical syntax, from the modern angle of perpetual motion. It has long been known that all things are in a state of flux, but it has taken linguists some time to realize the full application of this old truth. Though works of this sort are not likely to be read through by many, both students and lecturers will often be glad to refer to such a careful study, with its conscientious 'dépouillement des textes,' both for the elucidation of many passages in the authors of the period dealt with, and also for the determination of the dates at which old forms were replaced by those current in more modern times.

LONDON. F. C. JOHNSON.

Alliteration in the Chanson de Roland and in the Carmen de Prodicione Guenonis. By ALEXANDER HAGGERTY KRAPPE. Iowa City, Iowa. 1921. 82 pp.

In the *Chanson de Roland*, the use of alliteration is noticeably frequent. Is the use of this figure merely accidental, the result of a popular liking for alliterating formulas, or is it deliberate on the part of the poet—a part of his technique? If it is a poetical device, is the

Digitized by Google Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

manner of its use in the *Chanson* related to the Teutonic, the Classical or the Mediaeval Latin usage? If to the Mediaeval, can any close connection be observed between its use by Turoldus and by the author of the *Carmen de Prodicione Guenonis*—that florid Latin poem on the Roland theme? These, in brief, are the questions that the author of this dissertation has set himself to study, and his conclusions may be briefly summarised as follows:

(1) The use of alliteration by Turoldus serves 'a very definite purpose in the structure of the epic verse' (p. 61). Professor Krappe finds that more often than not alliteration is introduced deliberately to link together or unify hemistiches or lines and more rarely series of lines.

(2) The older type to which the poet's practice stands in closest affinity is that of the Mediaeval Latin poets: with the Teutonic it has little in common except in the use of alliterating proper names, e.g. Gerins and Geriers, Yvorie, Ivon, etc.

(3) The *Roland* poet's practice in the matter of alliteration is very similar to that of the author of the *Carmen*, which contains 'practically all types of alliteration which are found in the *Roland*' (p. 51), but the *Carmen* poet used more with 'more and more complex alliterations than the Old French poet,' and there is no evidence of direct influence of the one on the other. 'We see clearly that alliteration is used as a poetic device in both [poems]; but it is clearly impossible to conclude from them whether the poet of the *Carmen*, noticing the many alliterations in the *Roland*, imitated this device, overdoing it—or whether Turoldus had before him the *Carmen* and introduced the same device he saw there used' (p. 51).

These conclusions are reached by careful and judicious comparison and tabulations; they are in accordance with other indications of the *Roland* poet's high technical skill and with the relation in which much of Old French vernacular poetry stands to the Mediaeval Latin poetry, and Professor Krappe is, I think, to be congratulated on producing for his thesis a carefully executed and useful piece of work that may be the prelude to studies on a more extended scale.

M. K. Pope.

Oxford.

The French Tradition in Education. By H. C. Barnard. Cambridge: University Press. 1922. 8vo. vi + 318 pp. 10*s.* 6*d.*

The author of *The Little Schools of Port-Royal* and *The Port-Royalists on Education* presents in this third work a study of various developments in French education, from the time of the Renaissance to the confines of the Revolution. Each of the eight chapters is a separate whole, describing the life and labours of some great pioneer in education, from Ramus to Madame Necker de Saussure. The book is scholarly and carefully documented with fresh material, yet it will attract the general reader who desires to know something of the history and sources of the best features in French education, but who needs guidance and occasional

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

explanation of terms such as 'répéter,' 'composition,' 'morale,' in the special sense of the French class-room. Not the least interesting part is the comparison of the difficulties which confronted the French educators of the sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, with some of the problems which have to be solved to-day in our own country.

Two chapters are devoted to the University of Paris and to the reforms initiated or attempted by Ramus and Rollin respectively. Tradition and conservatism were a dead weight in the University system, blocking all attempts at progress, when Ramus, a true son both of the Reformation and the Renaissance, planted the seeds of reform, the full fruits of which were only gathered by others. Mr Barnard describes the fight against mediaevalism of this French Plato, 'the greatest French thinker of the sixteenth century.' The mediaeval curriculum had applied the methods of Aristotle, as known in their Latin dress, to the Christian religion, and to human knowledge generally. Ramus, inspired rather by the Socratic method, was one of the first to examine Aristotle critically, and he subsequently applied the same treatment to Cicero. His works both on philosophy and rhetoric were burnt, and he is alluded to in a contemporary record as 'universitatis hostis.' He had, however, at first achieved some success; there seem to have been upwards of two thousand hearers at his inaugural lecture at the newly-founded Collège Royal (now the Collège de France), in which institution the results of recent research were dealt with, as they still are, in independence of the University curriculum. But the passion for freedom of mind and the devotion to truth displayed by the new professor soon roused the hostility of his fellow-teachers, and he fell a victim to the massacre of Saint Bartholomew. His work lived on. He had seen the importance to philosophy of both mathematics and natural science: he sought rules through illustrations, so clearing away the 'espines et cailloux' from the path of the student. In his belief in the inductive and critical method of research he is, to a certain extent, a forerunner of Bacon. One of his attempted reforms relates to a still unsolved problem, upon which such masters as Paul Meyer and M. Antoine Thomas have not agreed, the question of a system of phonetic or at least simplified spelling.

After the death of Ramus the University of Paris almost ceased to exist: the forty-three colleges belonging to it remained, but seem to have been used as stables, or for other purposes remotely connected with education. Tradition was heavy in what remained of the old system. But Ramus had heralded a new era. The authorities gradually yielded to the reforms which he had demanded. The subsequent work of Rollin as a devoted teacher, though not a fiery innovator like Ramus, and the celebrated *Traité des Etudes* of the former, set Descartes by the side of Aristotle in the philosophy of the University, and placed the study of the mother tongue on a firm basis in the curriculum.

The education of girls in France is studied in the chapter on Anne de Xainctonge. Ladies of quality were, as in England, often highly cultivated at the time of the Renaissance, but the education of the daughters of the people was confined to reading, writing and a smattering

Digitized by Google

Original from
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

of figures, which did not amount to much more than Mrs Malaprop's 'supercilious knowledge in accounts.' A speech is quoted from a contemporary report of an educational conference in which teachers are advised to warn the girls (and even the boys!) against vanity, luxury, pride, vain adornments, bare necks and bosoms and shoulders and arms, curled and powdered hair. As for the teachers themselves, they seem to have regarded their profession as a salutary form of penance. Anne of Xainctonge infused a new spirit into girls' education, and the cheerful methods and the new sweetness and light which characterized the work and influence of the teaching community which she founded, caused the movement to spread. An appendix gives an extract from a record of the time, showing the regulations as to habits and conduct which prevailed among these Dames de Sainte Ursule.

Huguenot education is examined with special reference to Calvin and his belief in the power of a good training and a knowledge of the liberal arts. French Protestantism has always believed in the cultivation of the mind as a means to sound private judgment, and we are reminded that at first the Reformation and the Renaissance were closely allied in France. Marguerite, sister of François I, and that king himself, both favoured the new opinions, and did much for the cause of learning. Printing made the Bible accessible, and the very stringency of the Protestant training was not without its intellectual value. Later, during the blackest time of persecution, education was never considered a luxury, to be subject to cuts. Mr Barnard has drawn largely upon the reports of the Huguenot National Synods, and also gives in an appendix the long list of Huguenot Colleges with which he is specially concerned. The temporary eclipse of French Protestantism, after the assassination of Henri IV, led to a relaxation of its discipline: Huguenot students so far forgot themselves as to wear long hair, ribbons and silk gloves. A short time of toleration was followed by the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes; the pastors who had provided the Church with an 'able, godly and painful ministry,' were banished, and all Protestant schools were closed (to the number of thirty-five), as those of Port-Royal had been twenty-five years previously, to the lasting impoverishment of the intellectual life of the country.

The education of princes was a matter of the first importance at a time when the decay of feudalism and the centralization of government made the sovereign supreme, an embodiment of the State in his own person. Humanists looked to enlightened princes to be their patrons, hence the necessity of enlightening those princes in their youth, of educating the masters, a different aspect of the problem which confronts us to-day. The plan of engaging a private tutor was adopted by Louis XIV for the Grand Dauphin. The methods followed by Bossuet in this task, as described in his letter to Innocent XI, are analysed and the reasons for his failure traced, not only in the listless character of the royal pupil, but in the fact that the Dauphin's gifts, such as they were, lay in the direction of mathematics and applied science. 'You do not know what trouble is if you have never been obliged to write proses,' he is reported

Digitized by Google

Original from
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

to have groaned to a lady seeking consolation in bereavement. The Duc de Montausier, his 'gouverneur,' evidently had not the key to his character, which is taken by Mr Barnard as typical of the modern 'middle-school thicks,' who are active on the physical side, but torpid intellectually, and yet often develop practical ability and a taste for science. An interesting digression suggests that a curriculum composed of handicraft, practical science, and languages taught by the direct method, might meet the case of many modern boys who possess the particular endowments of the Dauphin. The connection between Bossuet's literary work and his educational activity is also traced, and in particular the original aim and intention of the *Discours sur l'Histoire Universelle*, and the treatise *De la Connaissance de Dieu et de Soi-même*, as text-books for the ill-fated Dauphin.

Of the teaching Congregations, in whose hands lay so large a part of secondary education in France during the seventeenth century, Mr Barnard considers the Oratorians to have been the best both in method and in breadth of mind. Originally modelled on the Italian Oratory or praying Order, this society in France was a national Gallican Order without vows, very different from the Jesuits with their Ultramontane leanings. Devoted in their beginnings to worship and music (the word Oratorio is said to owe its origin to their skill in Church singing), they spread as a teaching Order over France and beyond, as is shown in the Appendix by a list of their Colleges and a map indicating the distribution of these foundations. With its ardour for progress, the Oratorian teaching Order welcomed the Revolution and was at first preserved from abolition. 'Theirs was the spirit that made the Revolution possible.'

The chapter on the national organization of education is largely concerned with La Chalotais, first with his report drawn up for the Parlement de Rennes, dealing with the weak sides of Jesuit education, and then with the more general recommendations of his later *Essai d'Education Nationale*. 'Men were coming to realize that in education there are factors of greater importance than efficiency of teaching and organization, or even the absence of school fees.' This essay, though overshadowed by Rousseau's *Emile*, is shown to have inspired many of Napoleon's educational reforms, and to have given the actual system of education in France to-day much of its special character. The aim was to be, not knowledge, but an attitude towards life, 'a spirit of illumination, useful for everything, applicable to everything, which relates each thing to its principles without reference to current opinion or custom.' Women are recognized as citizens, and national provision is to be made for their training. Re-echoing Fénelon, La Chalotais exclaims: 'It is inconceivable that the education of women in France should have been so much neglected....Girls must be educated in the same way as boys.... Let us dare to aim at perfection.'

The last chapter, on Early Education and the work of Madame Necker de Saussure, cousin and friend of Madame de Staël, contains an analysis of *L'Education Progressive*, with its acute and practical psycho-

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

logy of childhood. The child is not a miniature adult but an immature being, with infinite possibilities, whom Madame Necker would fain see trained *sub specie aeternitatis*. The importance of her book, as a contribution to the application of psychology to education, is brought out in the final pages of this eminently readable and well-informed work.

As well as the appendices and maps already alluded to, there are a full bibliography and a good index. A useful addition would be a summary of the leading points of each chapter, for convenience of reference.

F. C. JOHNSON.

LONDON.

Antonio Pérez. By JULIA FITZMAURICE-KELLY. (*Hispanic Notes and Monographs*, Spanish Series, VI.) London: H. Milford. 1922. x + 170 pp. 7*s.* 6*d.*

Luis de Camões. By AUBREY F. G. BELL. (*Hispanic Notes and Monographs*, Portuguese Series, IV.) London: H. Milford. 1923. xxx + 160 pp. 7*s.* 6*d.*

There is some irony in the accident which brings together under one heading Pérez and Camões, respectively the typical Iberian traitor and patriot, though that the former should illustrate polemics and personalities by state secrets is less remarkable in this century. Mrs Fitzmaurice-Kelly occupies the first 96 pages of her work, which has a bibliographical basis as broad and satisfying as we have learned to expect from that literary workshop, with a clear, readable and consistent summary of the political life of Antonio Pérez in Spain, France and England. The cautious reader may be surprised and pleased to miss the 'mystery' of Pérez in this section, as Mrs Fitzmaurice-Kelly prefers to trust all men's bona fides, and the dramatis personæ emerge, apart from the peccadillo of murder (p. 9), with a gratifying number of marks to their credit. But the writer's purpose is not historical (p. v). We hope, therefore, that in a second edition, which will surely be called for, she will allow herself more space to develop the interest of the letters, and transfer some of the Spanish of chapters X and XI (particularly the bibliographical pp. 114–116) to the Notes.

Mr Bell's most welcome life of Camões fills the gap between Sir Richard Burton and the coming definitive edition of the *Rimas*. While putting before the English reader the critical developments of Braga, Storck, D. Carolina Michaelis de Vasconcellos, Dr J. M. Rodrigues, and himself, he has done a considerable service to future scholarship by reducing to the dimension of hypothesis assertions which were coming to form a system. The new Couto MS., whether admissible or not, has at least had the value of a question-mark against some of these affirmations.

Mr Bell's treatment of the life is full, felicitous, and eminently sane, and it makes delightful reading. A few details suggest themselves to us for further consideration. In accounting for the poet's exile to India,

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Mr Bell does full justice to the element of compulsion; but we are not sure that he allows for a possible element of choice as expressed by Sra. de Vasconcellos (*Os Lusiadas*, *Bibliotheca Romanica*, No. 10, pp. 14–15): 'Concluo que a expatriação de Camões foi voluntária, e não condição imposta.' Though an hypothesis, the traditions and consequences which accompany it are of such importance for the history of the poet's mind that they seem to deserve a fuller treatment than that on p. 77 (cf. p. 32). The shipwreck on the Mekong is several times referred to as a landmark in the poet's life (pp. 49, 77, etc.), but always with reference to *Lus.* x, 128 and not to the famous aposiopesis of *Lus.* vii, 78. So the inference that 'the *Lusiads* was practically complete at the end of 1558' cannot, in our opinion, be made with certainty of anything which follows the aposiopesis. And, thirdly, in the new Couto MS., quoted in Note 85, though the prose is confused, we think the construction is, 'Aqui em Moçambique achamos...aly se lhe afogou hũa moça China...Aly fez tambem aquella grave e docta Canção q. começa:

Sobre os rios que vão....'

'Aly,' thus, is Siam, as in the traditional account of the composition of the *redondilhas*, and not Moçambique 1569 as on pp. 38, 97 and 136. Mr Bell's last chapter is a splendid and eloquent appreciation (a faculty in which he is unequalled, and indeed unapproached, among writers in English on Hispanic themes) of the author of the *Rimas*: he ranges himself definitely with those who 'prefer the lyrics to the epic' (p. 81). But he seems to lay aside his singing-robes when he approaches the *Lusiads*. It is possible that modern criticism and practice are too much preoccupied with personality in literature and too little with community; for the rarer achievement is to gather up in one work the common emotion and aspiration of a nation, civilization or religion. It seems a somewhat disintegrating, though brilliant, criticism to describe the poem as 'a bundle of incidents' which will 'always remain one of the world's greatest poems by reason of its magnificent lyric flights,' even if we add that it shows 'great power of concentration.' In this manner Vergil might provide a tragedy, a metaphysico-historical lyric, and an elegy on two friends: but our more direct cultural descent and the schoolmaster's ferrule bring us back to the unity of Vergil. It is a conscious effort which is required to educate ourselves into the meaning of the *Lusiads*: but we continue to think that the supreme message of Camões lies not in the parts but in the whole.

William J. Entwistle.
Manchester.

A History of German Versification. Ten Centuries of Metrical Evolution. By Henry Gibson Atkins. London: Methuen and Co. 1923. 8vo. xvi + 282 pp. 10*s.* 6*d.*

In the Preface to his work Professor Atkins claims that it is the first attempt in English to deal comprehensively with the history of German versification. There was certainly ample room for a book com-

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

bining, as this does, an uncontroversial treatment of difficult metrical questions with a complete survey of the evolution of German verse, and students of German poetry owe much to Professor Atkins's clear and interesting presentation of the subject.

The work is divided into four parts, of which the second, the author tells us, is to be regarded as containing the central theme—viz., a historical survey of metrical evolution. Book I deals briefly with general questions of aesthetics, with rhythm and accent, rhyme and metrical variation, and with the ever difficult problem of terminology. Book II gives a concise outline of the development of German metre from the oldest alliterative verse, through Old High German and Middle High German rhymed verse to Opitz's reform, the verse of the classical period and that of the nineteenth century. In Book III the author goes on to consider in detail the chief modern lines. This part is intended as a supplementary account of the most important and distinctive lines used in modern German poetry, since the author felt that a detailed discussion of each new verse as it arose would have destroyed the continuity of the historical account in the second book. He therefore treats separately of 'syllabic' verse—including the alexandrine, blank verse, the chief other iambic lines, and trochaic lines—'non-syllabic' national verse—including an interesting discussion of the Knittelvers, and the free rhythms so important in German poetry—and the 'classical' lines used by German writers. In Book IV we find a detailed discussion of modern strophic forms, under the headings of classical strophes, Romance strophes, Oriental strophes (with some interesting illustrations from nineteenth century poets) and the older national strophes revived in the later nineteenth century. Such an arrangement of the material inevitably involves a considerable amount of recapitulation, especially between the second and third books. This drawback is felt by the author, for at the beginning of the third part he explains the reasons for his disregard of it. It is not difficult to justify such a procedure in a volume of this kind by adducing the increased value of the book as a work of reference; possibly for this purpose references to the different lines and strophes might be included in the Index, as are those to the definitions of feet and of metrical terms in general.

In the introductory first book, the author does little more than sketch the various theories of the origin of rhythm and metre, referring the reader for further detail to the works of Sievers, Bücher, Saran and others, who have considerably influenced his brief presentation of the subject. The reviewer is inclined to agree with Professor Lascelles Abercrombie when he says in his recently published *Principles of English Prosody* (§ 4 (i)): 'neither the physical nature of rhythm, nor the psychological nature of the rhythmic sense, belongs to the study of prosody.' The important question of the nature of accent, and of the chief factors of accent in German, is more fully discussed, and the author adopts almost entirely the conclusions of Paul in the *Grundriss der germanischen Philologie*. The consideration of pitch and melody, while brief, gives full value to the recent work of Sievers, Saran and Rutz on

Digitized by Google

Original from
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

new and interesting lines. On all these points, however, the author has felt himself obliged by the nature of his aim to steer a middle course between mere mention and full discussion. He has therefore adopted the expedient of giving excellent bibliographies at the end of each chapter, to supplement the general bibliography at the beginning; and to the student of metrical evolution these reference lists form a very valuable part of the book. In the historical account of alliterative verse which succeeds the general part, Professor Atkins closely follows Sievers's classic treatment of the subject; in the discussion of Old High German rhyming verse he owes much, as all later critics must, to Paul, but he also gives a clear and interesting account of the newer view of Otfrid's versification, explaining, with illustrations from the great Latin hymns, the influence of accentual Ambrosian verse upon the German poet. In the modern sections, he deals with the technique of verse and strophe in detail, with ample illustration, covering in this respect much the same ground as Kauffmann in his *Deutsche Metrik*—the German compilation which, though more technical and less insistent on the relating of technique to metrical theory, is yet the most similar to the present volume. The collection of examples in the third and fourth books, while helping materially to the appreciation of modern metrical developments, will endear the volume to lovers of eighteenth and nineteenth century German poetry; and it will undoubtedly be a valuable addition to the library of every student of German.

BANGOR, N. WALES. EDNA PURDIE.

Die Kulturwerte der deutschen Literatur von der Reformation bis zur Aufklärung. Von KUNO FRANCKE. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung. 8vo. xiv + 638 pp. 9 M.

Professor Kuno Francke's *History of German Literature as determined by Social Forces*, or, as it was originally entitled, *Social Forces in German Literature: a Study in the History of Civilization*, has, for a quarter of a century and more, been a trusted and inspiring guide to students both in this country and America. It was built up on a hypothesis that 'all literary development is determined by the incessant conflict of two elemental human tendencies: the tendency towards personal freedom and the tendency towards collective organization,' a hypothesis which only missed solving the enigma of literary evolution by its too narrow restriction. But stimulating the idea was in any case, and the good seed has borne fruit on both sides of the Atlantic. In 1911 Professor Francke published the first volume of the present work—it is designed to extend to four—in which he lays his English book in an enlarged form before a German public. Now, twelve years later, appears Volume II. The German work is by no means a mere translation; the 290 pages of the first volume represent about 130 of the English, and the 638 pages of the present volume are covered by little more than 160 of the original. It is pleasant to see the book visibly growing in its author's hands; it whets our appetite for what is still to come.

Digitized by Google Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

At first it might seem as if an attractive and necessary feature of the book, as designed for the English reader, the space devoted to descriptive matter, would be out of place for a public which might reasonably be assumed to have greater familiarity with the literature itself. But, as far as the period here covered is concerned, the German reading public is likely to stand as much in need of enlightenment as our own; in any case, Professor Francke's characterisations and illustrative quotations are so admirable that they are welcome even when they recapitulate familiar things. If there is room for criticism, it is perhaps that he is so intent on setting forth the great positive values of German literature that movements and authors whose importance from this angle is less apparent, do not always receive their due. The Renaissance literature centring in Opitz, for instance, is too briefly dismissed, and Wieland comes off relatively badly. Although just here Professor Francke might have recognised that, 'un-German' as Wieland's 'Kulturwert' in many ways may have been, none of the writers of the classic age thought more clearly on political questions than he; none had such prevision of the possibilities of the future German state.

Valuable to German scholars will be the appreciatory references to the contributions of American scholars to the study of German literature; but sometimes one would have liked to find a more detached American attitude on the part of the author himself. It is difficult, indeed, in reading this volume, to realise that Professor Francke has, for a generation, so ably represented German studies at a great American University, and has necessarily been in close touch with the Anglo-Saxon outlook on literature. One misses occasionally that 'distance' which is the most valuable contribution which criticism from abroad brings with it.

Professor Francke's English work is indispensable to all English students of German literature; this German version of it deserves to be no less warmly recommended. It has all the literary charm of the original, with the advantage of more detailed treatment; it is inspired by the same humane outlook, and—in spite of the terrible disruption of the last ten years, which has left only too visible traces on his pages—the same hopeful optimism. The remaining two volumes, which should be of greatly enhanced interest, will not, I trust, be too long in following.

J. G. Robertson.

London.

MINOR NOTICES.

No words are needed to recommend the *Bibliography of English Language and Literature* 1922, edited for The Modern Humanities Research Association by Miss A. C. Paues (Bowes & Bowes, Cambridge: 1923). Thanks to the labours of the Editor and her many distinguished helpers, this issue is still better than that of last year. An Index has been added as well as a list of the (more than two hundred) periodicals which have been searched. The text of the Bibliography

Digitized by Google

Original from
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

has been increased by over eighty pages, the entries now numbering over 3000, and the arrangement of the material has been somewhat simplified.

G. C. M. S.

The object of the 'Shakespeare Survey' series to be issued under the general direction of Sir Israel Gollancz is to show the influence of Shakespeare's works on different nations and peoples. A good start has been made in the first publication of the series, *Shakespeare in Poland* by Josephine Calina (Mrs Allardyce Nicoll) (London: H. Milford, for the Shakespeare Association, 1923. 61 pp. 6*s*.). It is clear that no more competent writer on this subject could have been selected, and it will be interesting to compare Mrs Nicoll's report of the gradual acclimatisation of Shakespeare in Poland with the reports to come from writers on other countries. In spite of the tyranny exercised by the French Classical Drama in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, 'Shakespeare,' we are told, 'in this twentieth century is fully established in the heart of Poland. In the Universities, naturally, he is studied; but even in the schools his influence is felt. Not only have those increasing numbers of students who study the English language to read his works in the original, but under the new Polish educational régime Shakespeare is read in all classes in...well-edited translations. ...At fourteen practically every Polish child receiving a school education comes into contact with Shakespeare: in his after-life Shakespeare stands before him continually on the stage.... Other countries have had longer courses of Shakespearian influence, but not one, I think, has treated Shakespeare so lovingly, has been so deeply indebted for its whole dramatic literature to his example, and has produced such outstanding tragedies based on his own great works.' Mrs Nicoll appends a Bibliography of Translations and Adaptations of Shakespeare in Polish and of the chief Polish critical works on Shakespeare.

G. C. M. S.

Two recent publications from Denmark merit wider attention. The first, Louis L. Hammerich's *Zur deutschen Akzentuation* issued in 1921 as VII, 1 of the important series of 'Historisk-filologiske Meddelelser' of the Royal Danish Academy of Sciences, tackles the question of stress-distribution in the various periods of High German by examining clues afforded by a metrical analysis of Old German verse (many of the interpretations necessarily being highly problematical) and then considering the utterances of the theorists from Albertus to Adelung. The work concludes with a useful comprehensive survey of such anomalies of Modern German stressing as occur e.g. among compound substantives (especially when twice compounded), place-names, derived adjectives, and words prefixed with *all-* and *un-*. Of topical interest are the author's criticisms of Sievers' speech-melody theory and Rutz's 'rumpfempfindungen' as applied to Old German verse and to Modern Danish. As a Dane, Hammerich summarily rejects Rutz's classification of Holger Drachmann, Oehlenschläger and J. P. Jacobsen! The other publication

Digitized by Google Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

is a second revised and enlarged edition of Professor Jespersen's *Modersmålets Fonetik*. The new matter in Chaps. XIII and XIV referred to in the preface is valuable; 'stress' is no longer held to be due to the expiratory energy alone, but to the cumulative effect of an intensified release of energy by all the organs concerned in the articulation. The careful transcripts at the end are full of interest, especially those dialect texts in which the 'Dania' system is used to bring out the more delicate nuances. The book is written with the author's customary lucidity and vigour, and his power of coining neat terms is once more manifest e.g. in *skeln* (kriterium), *stivhjerner* (doktrinærer), *hæmme* (spirant position), *spidslukke* like our 'point-stop' etc. Though the examples are drawn mainly from Danish and the book is primarily intended for Danes, much in the book should appeal to those occupied with general phonetics.

W. E. C.

Professor Wilhelm Horn of Giessen has now issued an anastatic reprint of his *Sprachkörper und Sprachfunktion* (*Palaestra*, CXXXV; Leipzig: Mayer und Müller, 1923). Its main thesis is that linguistic changes—most often loss or weakening of syllables—may be largely accounted for by weakening or loss of the function of the syllable or word concerned. The theory is illustrated by hundreds of examples from Greek, Latin, German, English, French and several other languages. Rather strangely no recourse is had to the modern Indian vernaculars, nor have all the examples cited escaped adverse criticism. But on the whole the work, the main idea of which is not new, has been recognised as a valuable step towards the clearing-up of a difficult problem. Some years ago, in the *Anglia-Beiblatt*, XXV, I termed the general principle involved 'the law of inferior importance.' In spite of the strenuous opposition to Horn's view offered by Karl Luick in *Englische Studien*, LVI, this principle, which was, as Horn discovered after finishing his own study, vigorously advanced in 1870 by G. Curtius, still seems to me one which it will be foolish in future to disregard.

M. M.

Dr W. W. Greg writes: The 'corrupt mediæval version' forming a link 'between Ovid and Cini' conjectured by Miss Welsford (*M.L.R.*, XVIII, 404, note) is, of course, Boccaccio's *Genealogia Deorum*, that vast storehouse of mythology, the great importance of which for later writers we are only beginning to appreciate. There in chap. 31 of the first book we find 'itathon' and 'Panthos' (index, 'Ithatona' and 'Panthus') given as 'ministri somni' (ed. Vicenza, 1487, fol. 13^{v} *b*). Probably, however, Cini used the Italian translation by Betussi (Venice, 1585) which gives the names as 'Itatone' and 'Pantho' (fol. 23).

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

September–November, 1923.

GENERAL.

BAILEY, J., The Continuity of Letters. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 12*s.* 6*d.*

BORINSKI, K., Die Antike in Poetik und Kunsttheorie, II, 4 (Das Erbe der Alten, I, 10). Leipzig, Dieterich. 1 M. 80.

BRUCE, J. D., The Evolution of Arthurian Romance from the Beginnings down to the Year 1300. I. (Hesperia, Erg. Reihe, viii.) Göttingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht. 10 M.

FUNKE, O., Über Prinzipienfragen der Sprachwissenschaft (*Engl. Studien*, lvii, 2).

GÜNTERT, H., Der arische Weltkönig und Heiland. Halle, M. Niemeyer. 14 M.

HEARN, L., Essays on European and Oriental Literature. Ed. by A. Mordell. London, Heinemann. 8*s.* 6*d.*

KELEMINA, J., Geschichte der Tristansage nach den Dichtungen des Mittelalters. Vienna, E. Hölzel. 85,000 Kr.

KRALIK, R., Die Weltliteratur der Gegenwart. Graz, Styria. 45,000 Kr.

LOANE, G. G., A Short Handbook of Literary Terms. London, Fisher Unwin. 5*s.*

MATTHEWS, B., Playwrights on Play Making, and other Studies of the Stage. London, Scribners. 10*s.* 6*d.*

NICOLL, A., An Introduction to Dramatic Theory. London, G. G. Harrap. 5*s.*

PATCH, H. R., The Tradition of the Goddess Fortuna in Medieval Philology and Literature (Smith College Stud. in Mod. Lang., iii, 4).

POWYS, J. C., Suspended Judgments: Essays on Books and Sensations. New York, Amer. Libr. Service. $3.

RALEIGH, SIR W., Some Authors: a Collection of Literary Essays, 1896–1916. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 15*s.*

ROBERTSON, J. G., Studies in the Genesis of Romantic Theory in the Eighteenth Century. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 12*s.* 6*d.*

SELINCOURT, B. DE, The English Secret, and other Essays. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 10*s.* 6*d.*

Vassar Mediæval Studies. By Members of the Faculty of Vassar College. Ed. by C. F. Fiske. New Haven, Yale Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 24*s.*

WERNER, H., Die Ursprünge der Lyrik. Eine entwicklungs-psychologische Untersuchung. Munich, Reinhardt. 5 M.

ROMANCE LANGUAGES.

Italian.

ALFIERI, V., Mirra. Interpretata da A. Momigliano. Florence, Vallecchi. L. 5.

BANDELLO, M., Il Canzoniere. Con introduzione e note di F. Picco. Turin, Unione Tip. L. 10.

BELLORINI, E., G. Giusti. Rome, Formiggini. L. 3.50.

BORGESE, G. A., Tempo di edificare. Milan, Treves. L. 9.

CHIURLO, B., La letteratura ladina del Friuli. Udine, Libr. Carducci. L. 5.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Del Lungo, I., Per la lingua d' Italia, un vecchio accademico della Crusca. Bologna, Zanichelli. L. 7.50.

De Lorenzo, G., Leopardi e Schopenhauer. Naples, Ricciardi. L. 3.

De Rubertis, A., I Guadagnoli. Nuove ricerche su Baldassarre, Pietro e Antonio. Arezzo, Viviani. L. 10.

Fusai, G., G. Procacci e i suoi scritti pascoliani. Benevento, Tip. S. Sofia. L. 15.

Gardner, E. G., Tommaso Campanella and his Poetry. Taylorian Lecture, 1923. Oxford, Clar. Press. 2*s*.

Gentile, G., Dante e Manzoni. Florence, Vallecchi. L. 8.

Gentile, G., Studi sul Rinascimento. Florence, Vallecchi. L. 12.

Intravaja, I., La Poesia di G. G. Pontano. Palermo, G. Priulla. L. 8.

Leopardi, G., Pensieri di varia filosofia e di bella letteratura. iv. Florence, Le Monnier. L. 10.

Manzoni, A., Scritti sulla lingua italiana. A cura di G. Lesca. Florence, Barbera. L. 8.

Momigliano, A., G. Verga narratore. Palermo, G. Priulla. L. 5.

Pascoli, G., Poems. Freely rendered by E. Stein. New Haven, Yale Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 9*s*.

Petrarca, F., Epistolae selectae. Ed. A. F. Johnson. Oxford, Clar. Press. 8*s*. 6*d*.

Reinhard, J. R., Florismondo: ex Damnatissima Amadisi Bibliotheca (*Publ. M. L. A. Amer.*, xxxviii, 3, Sept.).

Rossi, G., M. Cesarotti critico e poeta. Salerno, Tip. Salernitano. L. 8.

Schileo, N., P. Bembo e le sorti della lingua nazionale nel Veneto nella prima metà del secolo decimosesto. Rome, La Casa del Libro. L. 5.

Sciuto Salvo, L., Le bellezze dell' Orlando Furioso. Turin, Soc. Ed. Internaz. L. 12.50.

Shackford, M. H., The Magi in Florence: an Aspect of the Renaissance (*Stud. Phil. Nth. Carolina*, xx, 4).

Tre Compagni, La Leggenda dei. Testo senese inedito del XV sec. Appendice e discussione critica di Z. Lazzeri. Florence, Giannini. L. 12.

Zabughin, V., L' oltretomba classico, medioevale, dantesco nel Rinascimento. i. Florence, Olschki. L. 15.

Ziino, M., Raffronti manzoniani. Palermo, Priulla. L. 6.

Spanish.

Aguado, J. M., Tratado de las diversas clases de versos castellanos (*Bol. acad. españ.*, x, 49, Oct.).

Cervantes Saavedra, M. de, Obras completas. Edición de la Real Acad. Española. vii. Madrid, Rev. de Archivos. 10 pes.

Espronceda, J. de, Obras poéticas. Madrid, Rivadeneyra. 6 pes.

Feijóo y Montenegro, F. B. J., Teatro crítico universal. i. Edición de A. Miralles Carlo. Madrid, La Lectura. 5 pes.

Lull, R., The Book of the Lover and the Beloved. Transl. with an Introductory Essay by E. Allison Peers. London, Soc. for Promoting Christ. Knowledge. 3*s*. 6*d*.

Madariaga, S. de, The Genius of Spain and other Essays in Spanish Literature. Oxford, Clar. Press. 10*s*.

Mérimée, E., Le romancero espagnol. Paris, Renaiss. du livre. 4 fr.

Novela picaresca, La. Selección hecha por F. Ruiz. Madrid, Rev. de Archivos. 3 pes.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

PEERS, E. A., The 'Pessimism' of M. de Cabanyes (*Mod. Phil.*, xxi, 1, Aug.).

PÉREZ GALDÓS, B., Obras inéditas, ordenadas por A. Ghiraldo. I, II. Madrid, Ed. Bética. Each 4 pes.

PITOLLET, C., Datos biográficos sobre D. Pascual Rodríguez de Arellano y D. Rafael Floranes (*Rev. fil. espaň.*, x, 3).

PLA CÁRCELES, J., La evolución del tratamiento 'vuestra-merced' (*Rev. fil. espaň.*, x, 3).

SARALEGUI, M. DE, Escarceos filológicos (*Bol. acad. espaň.*, x, 49, Oct.).

WAGNER, M. L., Algunas observaciones generales sobre el judeo-español de oriente (*Rev. fil. espaň.*, x, 3).

French.

(*a*) *General* (*incl. Linguistic*).

BÉDIER, J., et P. HAZARD, Histoire de la littérature française illustrée. Paris, Larousse. 55 fr.

BUTLER, K., A History of French Literature. 2 vols. London, Methuen. 21*s*.

GRAMMONT, M., L'assimilation. Note de phonétique générale. Paris, Champion. 8 fr.

GRAMMONT, M., Le vers français, ses moyens d'expression, son harmonie. Paris, Champion. 25 fr.

HERMANT, A., Entretiens sur la grammaire française. Paris, Le Livre. 100 fr.

LANSON, G., Histoire illustrée de la littérature française. I. Paris, Hachette. 65 fr.

LONGNON, A., Les noms de lieu de la France. 3e fasc. Noms d'origine ecclésiastique. Paris, Champion. 12 fr.

RUDMOSE-BROWN, T. B., A Short History of French Literature from the Beginnings to 1900. Dublin, Educat. Co. of Ireland. 3*s*. 6*d*.

(*b*) *Old French.*

Chevalerie Vivien, La, Chanson de geste publ. par A. Terracher. Paris, Champion. 15 fr.

GENNRICH, F., Der musikalische Vortrag der altfranzösischen Chansons de geste. Halle, M. Niemeyer. 1 M. 20.

Guibert d'Andrenas, Chanson de geste. Ed. by Jessie Crosland. Manchester, Univ. Press. 4*s*. 6*d*.

Jeu de la Feuillée (Le), le Jeu de Robin et Marie, d'Adam. Éd. par E. Langlois. Paris, Boccard. 5 fr.

MULERTT, W., Studien zu den letzten Büchern des Amadisromans (Romanistische Arbeiten, xi). Halle, M. Niemeyer. 3 M.

PATCH, H. R., Fortuna in Old French Literature (Smith College Stud. in Mod. Lang., iv, 4).

Roi Flor (Le) et la belle Jeanne, Amis et Amiles. Éd. par G. Michaut. Paris, Boccard. 5 fr.

TERRACHER, G., La tradition manuscrite de la Chevalerie Vivien. Paris, Champion. 10 fr.

TILANDER, G., Remarques sur le Roman de Renart. Paris, Champion. 20 fr.

(*c*) *Modern French.*

ARNAVON, J., Notes sur l'interprétation de Molière. Paris, Plon. 20 fr.

BACOURT, P. DE, and J. W. CUNLIFFE, French Literature during the last Half-Century. London, Macmillan. 10*s*. 6*d*.

BALDENSPERGER, F., Les États-Unis dans la vie et les idées d'A. de Vigny (*Rev. litt. comp.*, iii, 4, Oct.).

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

BARRÈS, M., Dante, Pascal et Renan. Paris, Plon-Nourrit. 5 fr.

BARTHOU, L., Lamennais et J. B. de Saint-Victor (*Rev. d. deux Mondes*, Nov. 1).

BENDZ, E., La Daphné d'A. de Vigny. Paris, Stock. 5 fr.

BRONARSKI, A., Le petit Jehan de Saintré, une énigme littéraire. Contribution aux études sur Antoine de la Sale. Paris, Champion. 5 fr.

CAYROU, G., Le Français classique. Lexique de la langue du XVIIe siècle. Paris, H. Didier. 18 fr. 20.

CHAMPION, P., Histoire poétique du 15e siècle. 2 vols. Paris, Champion. 75 fr.

CHARLIER, G., Le premier Tartuffe. Paris, Champion. 3 fr.

CHIESA, G., La littérature française pendant la Révolution. Rome, Tip. Regionale.

DELACROIX, E., Œuvres littéraires. 2 vols. Paris, Crès. 15 fr.

DERMENGHEM, E., Joseph de Maistre mystique. Paris, La Connaissance. 20 fr.

DESTHIEUX, Taine, sa vie, son œuvre. Paris, Nouv. Rev. critique. 3 fr. 75.

French Comedies of the Eighteenth Century. Transl., with Introduction by R. Aldington (Broadway Translations). London, G. Routledge. 7*s.* 6*d.*

GARNIER, R., Œuvres complètes, avec notice et notes par L. Pinvert. 2 vols. Paris, Garnier. Each 7 fr. 50.

GIRAUD, V., Blaise Pascal. v. L'apologie (*Rev. d. deux Mondes*, Oct. 15).

HARLOR, TH., Madame de Staël. III. Paris, Ollendorff. 15 fr.

IVRAY, J. D', Madame de Staël et Monti (*Rev. mondiale*, Aug. 15).

KERDANIEL, E. L. DE, Un auteur dramatique du 15e siècle : André de la Vigne. Paris, Champion. 6 fr. 50.

LACRETELLE, P. DE, V. Hugo et ses éditeurs (*Rev. de France*, Oct. 15, Nov. 1).

LAMENNAIS, F. DE, Lettres à Saint-Victor (*Rev. d. deux Mondes*, Nov. 1).

LANCASTER, H. C., Don Juan in a French Play of 1630 (*Publ. M. L. A. Amer.*, xxxviii, 3, Sept.).

LANCASTER, H. C., Theophile de Viau his own Critic? (*Mod. Phil.*, xxi, 1 Aug.).

MALLARMÉ, S., Lettres à F. Coppée, publ. par J. Monval (*Rev. d. deux Mondes*, Oct. 1).

MAUGAIN, G., Fontenelle et l'Italie (*Rev. litt. comp.*, iii, 4, Oct.).

ROCHEBLAVE, S., Les correspondances inédites de G. Sand (*Journ. de Genève*, Oct. 1).

RONSARD, P., Œuvres complètes. Texte de 1578. Publ. par H. Vaganay. IV. Paris, Garnier. 7 fr. 50.

RUDLER, G., Les Techniques de la Critique et d'Histoire Littéraire en littérature française moderne. Oxford, Clar. Press. 8*s.* 6*d.*

SAND, G., et le PRINCE NAPOLÉON, Correspondance inédite. I. (*Rev. d. deux Mondes*, Aug. 15.)

SEYLAZ, L., E. A. Poe et les premiers symbolistes français. Lausanne, La Concorde.

SIMON, G., C. Baudelaire et V. Hugo (*Rev. de France*, Sept. 1, Oct. 1).

STEWART, H. F., and A. TILLEY, The Classical Movement in French Literature traced in a Series of Texts. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 7*s.*

STROWSKI, F., Histoire des lettres. II. De Ronsard à nos jours. Paris, Plon-Nourrit.

VIAL, E., M. Desbordes-Valmore et ses amis lyonnais. D'après une correspondance inédite. Paris, La Connaissance. 6 fr.

VILLON, F., Œuvres. Éd. par L. Thuasne. 3 vols. Paris, Picard. 50 fr.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

GERMANIC LANGUAGES.

Scandinavian.

BULL, F., og F. PAASCHE, Norsk litteraturhistorie. 1. hefte. Christiania, Aschehoug. 1 kr.

COOK, A. S., Ibn Fadlan's Account of Scandinavian Merchants on the Volga in 922 (*Journ. Engl. Germ. Phil.*, xxii, 1).

Edda, The Poetic. Transl. from the Icelandic with Introd. and Notes by H. A. Bellows. (Scandinavian Classics, xxi, xxii.) New York, Amer.-Scand. Foundation; London, H. Milford. $4.

ELSTER, K., Illustreret norsk Litteraturhistorie. I. Christiania, Gyldendal. 26 kr.

GEIJER, E. G., Samlade skrifter. XII. Brev till hans hustru, 1808–46. Stockholm, Norstedt och Söner. 10 kr.

GRØNDAHL, I., and O. RAKNES, Chapters in Norwegian Literature. London, Gyldendal. 8*s.* 6*d.*

HOLBERG, L., Samlede Skrifter. VI. Udg. af C. S. Petersen. Copenhagen, Gyldendal. 20 kr.

JÓNSSON, F., Den oldnorske og oldislandske Litteraturs Historie. 2. Udg. II, 3. Copenhagen, Gad. 16 kr. 50.

KIHLMAN, E., Ur Finlands svenska lyrik. Antologi. Stockholm. 12 kr.

KÜHLE, S., Kilderne til F. Paludan-Müllers Kalanus. Copenhagen, Aschehoug. 3 kr. 50.

LARSEN, H. A., Knut Hamsun. London, Gyldendal. 5*s.*

LØKEN, H., Ibsen og kjærligheten. En essay. Christiania, Gyldendal. 3 kr. 50.

MALONE, K., The Phonology of Modern Icelandic (Ottendorfer Memorial Series of Germanic Monographs, xiii). Menasha, Wis., Collegiate Press.

MARTENSEN-LARSEN, H., Paludan-Müller og Martensen. Copenhagen, Frimodt. 5 kr.

NEUMANN, F., Baumeister Solness (*Edda*, xx, 3).

NIELSEN, H., Holberg i Nutidsbelysning. En estetisk Undersøgelse. Copenhagen, Aschehoug. 8 kr. 50.

NOREEN, A., Altisländische und Altnorwegische Grammatik. (Altnordische Grammatiken, I.) 4te Aufl. Halle, M. Niemeyer. 10 M.

PALUDAN, J., Geijer og Grundtvig (*Edda*, xx, 3).

RIMESTAD, C., Fra Stuckenberg til Seedorff. Den lyriske Renæssance i Danmark. 2 vols. Copenhagen, Pio. 13 kr.

SCHÜCK, H., Från Linnés tid. Petter Forskål. Stockholm, Norstedt och Söner. 8 kr. 75.

SCHÜCK, H., Histoire de la littérature suédoise. Trad. de L. Maury. Paris, Leroux. 12 fr. 50.

SCHULZE-BERGHOE, P., Ibsens Kaiser und Galiläer als Zeitsinnbild. Rudolstadt, Greifenverlag. 3 M.

STURTEVANT, A. M., Die Behandlung der Lautgruppen *we* und *wa* bei den altnordischen starken Verben (*Journ. Engl. Germ. Phil.*, xxii, 2).

TOPSØE, V., Udvalgte Skrifter. Ved V. Andersen og H. Topsøe-Jensen. 1. hæfte. Copenhagen, Gad. 4 kr.

WEIGAND, H. J., The Secret Mark of the Beast (*Journ. Engl. Germ. Phil.*, xxii, 1).

WERGELAND, H., Samlede Skrifter. IV. Utg. av H. Jæger og D. A. Seip. Copenhagen, Steenske Forlag. 38 kr.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Old Saxon. Low German.

BASLER, O., Altsächsisch. Heliand, Genesis und kleinere Denkmäler. In erläuterten Textproben. Freiburg, F. Wagner. 6 M. 80.

SARAUW, C., Das niederdeutsche Spiel von Theophilus. Kritische Ausgabe (Det kgl. Danske Videnskabernes Selskab., Hist.-filol. Meddelser, viii, 3). 2 kr.

English.

(*a*) *General* (*incl. Linguistic*).

BRADLEY, H., and R. BRIDGES, On the Terms Briton, British, Britisher; H. FOWLER, Preposition at end. S. P. E. Tract, No. xiv. Oxford, Clar. Press. 2*s*. 6*d*.

EKWALL, E., English Place-Names in -ing (Skrifter utg. av kungl. human. vetenskaps samf. i Lund, vi). Lund, C. W. K. Gleerup.

Problem of Grammar, The. Engl. Assoc. Pamphlets, No. 53. 1*s*.

READ, W. A., Some Phases of American Pronunciation (*Journ. Engl. Germ. Phil.*, xxii, 2).

WATSON, G., The Roxburghshire Word-Book (Trans. of Scott. Dialects Committee). Cambridge, Univ. Press. 20*s*.

(*b*) *Old and Middle English.*

BOER, R. C., Beowulf (*Engl. Studies*, v, 3–4, Aug.).

COHN, M., Ist die Wortstellung ein brauchbares Kriterium für die Chronologie angelsächsischer Denkmäler? (*Engl. Studien*, lvii, 3).

GARRETT, R. M., 'Cleopatra the Martyr' and her Sisters (*Journ. Engl. Germ. Phil.*, xxii, 1).

GRAVES, T. S., Some Chaucer Allusions (1561–1700) (*Stud. Phil. Nth. Carol.*, xx, 4).

HITTMAIR, R., Das Zeitwort 'do' in Chaucers Prosa (Wiener Beitr. z. engl. Phil., li). Vienna, Braumüller. 7 M.

KLAEBER, F., Eine Bemerkung zum altenglischen Passivum (*Engl. Studien*, lvii, 2).

MORSBACH, L., Mittelenglische Originalurkunden von der Chaucer-Zeit bis zur Mitte des xv. Jahrh. (Alt- und Mittelenglische Texte, x). Heidelberg, C. Winter. 1 M. 80.

PATCH, H. R., and R. MENNER, Bibliography of Middle English Dialects (*Stud. Phil. Nth. Carol.*, xx, 4).

SCHAUBERT, E. VON, Der englische Ursprung von Syr Gawayn and the Green Knyȝt (*Engl. Studien*, lvii, 3).

TATLOCK, J. S. P., Epic Formulas, especially in Laȝamon (*Publ. M. L. A. Amer.*, xxxviii, 3, Sept.).

(*c*) *Modern English.*

ADAMS, J. Q., A Life of William Shakespeare. London, Constable. 21*s*.

AUSTEN, J., The Novels of. 5 vols. Ed. by R. W. Chapman. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 65*s*.

BITZKAT, F., R. Brownings 'A Toccata of Galuppi's' (*Engl. Studien*, lvii, 2).

BRANDL, A., Zur Psychologie des Dichtens bei Burns (Preuss. Akad. der Wiss., Philos.-lit. Kl. xxi). Berlin, De Gruyter. 30 Pf.

CARLYLE, T., Letters of, to J. S. Mill, J. Sterling and R. Browning. Ed. by A. Carlyle. London, F. Unwin. 25*s*.

CASPARI, H., E. A. Poes Verhältnis zum Okkultismus. Hannover, Adam. 2 M.

Cavalier and Puritan. Ballads and Broadsides illustrating the Period of the Great Rebellion, 1640–60. Ed. by H. E. Rollins. New York, New York Univ. Press.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

CAWLEY, R. R., Drayton and the Voyagers (*Publ. M. L. A. Amer.*, xxxviii, 3, Sept.).

Christmas Prince, The. Ed. by F. S. Boas. Malone Society Reprints.

CONGREVE, W., The Complete Works. 4 vols. London, Nonesuch Press. 63*s.*

COTTON, C., The Poems of 1630–87. Ed. by J. Beresford. London, Cobden-Sanderson. 15*s.*

DEFOE, D., The Fortunate Mistress. London, Constable. 24*s.*

DONOVAN, T., The True Text of Shakespeare and of his Fellow Playwrights. London, Macmillan. 2*s.*

DUFF, E. G., The Fifth Edition of Burton's Anatomy of Melancholy (*Library*, iv, 2, Sept.).

DUTT, S., Shakespeare's Macbeth. An Oriental Study. Calcutta, Roy Chowdhury. 1*s.*

FAUSSET, H. I'A., Studies in Idealism. London, Dent. 6*s.*

FERGUSON, J. DE L., Rudyard Kipling's Revisions of his Published Work (*Journ. Engl. Germ. Phil.*, xxii, 1).

FITZGERALD, E., Some New Letters of. Ed. by F. R. Barton. London, Williams and Norgate. 8*s.* 6*d.*

GALSWORTHY, J., Works. I, II. London, Heinemann.

GARROD, H. W., Wordsworth. Lectures and Essays. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 7*s.* 6*d.*

GEROULD, G. H., The Making of Ballads (*Mod. Phil.*, xxi, 1, Aug.).

GILBERT, A. H., The Problem of Evil in 'Paradise Lost' (*Journ. Engl. Germ. Phil.*, xxii, 1).

GREENE, R. Groats Worth of Witte. The Repentance of R. Greene, 1592. Ed. by G. B. Harrison. (Bodley Head Quartos.) London, J. Lane. 3*s.*

GREENWOOD, SIR G., Lee, Shakespeare, and a Tertium Quid. London, C. Palmer. 5*s.*

GREG, W. W. An Elizabethan Printer and his Copy (*Library*, iv, 2, Sept.).

GREG, W. W., Two Elizabethan Stage Abridgements: The Battle of Alcazar and Orlando Furioso (Malone Society). Oxford, Clarendon Press. 21*s.*

HAVENS, G. R., James Madison et la pensée française (*Rev. de litt. comp.*, iii, 4, Oct.).

HERBERT OF CHERBURY, LORD, The Poems, English and Latin. Edit. by G. C. Moore Smith. Oxford, Clar. Press. 12*s.* 6*d.*

HOTSON, J. L., George Jolly, Actor Manager (*Stud. Phil. Nth. Carol.*, xx, 4).

HOUGHTON, R. E. C., The Influence of the Classics on the Poetry of M. Arnold. Oxford, Blackwell. 2*s.* 6*d.*

HOUSTON, P. H., Doctor Johnson. A Study in Eighteenth Century Humanism. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 15*s.*

HUSTVEDT, S. B., G. Borrow and his Danish Ballads (*Journ. Engl. Germ. Phil.*, xxii, 2).

JENKINS, R., Drayton's Relation to the School of Donne (*Publ. M. L. A. Amer.*, xxxviii, 3, Sept.).

John a Kent and John a Cumber (Malone Society Reprints).

Johnson, Dr Samuel, Contemporary Criticism of. Ed. by J. K. Spittal. London, J. Murray. 16*s.*

JOHNSON, S., Proposals for Edition of Shakespeare, 1756. London, H. Milford. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

JONSON, B., Discoveries, 1641; Conversations with William Drummond of Hawthornden, 1619. (Bodley Head Quartos.) Ed. by G. B. Harrison. London, J. Lane. Each 3*s*.

KELLETT, E. E., Suggestions: Literary Essays. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 7*s*. 6*d*.

KOOISTRA, J., On the Character of Desdemona (*Engl. Studies*, v, 3–4, Aug.).

KÜHNEMUND, R., Die Rolle des Zufalls in Shakespeares Meistertragödien (Stud. zur engl. Phil., lxvii). Halle, M. Niemeyer. 1 M.

LAMB, C., Criticism. A selection, ed. by E. M. W. Tillyard. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 5*s*.

LILJEGREN, S. B., La pensée de Milton et G. Bruno (*Rev. litt. comp.*, iii, 4, Oct.).

Malone Society, The. Collections, II, 2. (The Cruel Debtor, a further fragment. Four Letters on Theatrical Affairs, ed. by E. K. Chambers. The Academic Drama at Cambridge: Extracts from College Records, ed. by G. C. Moore Smith.)

MOORE, J. R., The Tradition of Angelic Singing in English Drama (*Journ. Engl. Germ. Phil.*, xxii, 1).

Munchausen, The Travels of Baron. Ed. by W. Rose. (Broadway Translations.) London, G. Routledge. 7*s*. 6*d*.

NETHERCOT, A. H., The Reputation of Abraham Cowley (*Publ. M. L. A. Amer.*, xxxviii, 3, Sept.).

NEWMAN, J. H., The Dream of Gerontius (1865). With some words on the poem by W. F. P. Stockley. London, Heath Cranton. 7*s*. 6*d*.

NICOLL, A., A History of Restoration Drama, 1660–1700. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 16*s*.

NICOLL, SIR W. ROBERTSON, Dickens's own Story. London, Chapman and Hall. 10*s*. 6*d*.

OMOND, T. S., Some Thoughts about Verse (Engl. Assoc. Pamphlets, No. lv). 1*s*.

PADELFORD, F. M., The Spiritual Allegory of the Faerie Queene. Book I. (*Journ. Engl. Germ. Phil.*, xxii, 1.)

PEACOCK, T. L., Nightmare Abbey. Reprinted from the Edition of 1818. London, H. Milford. 3*s*. 6*d*.

POLLARD, A. W., and others. Shakespeare's Hand in the Play of Sir Thomas More. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 10*s*.

POTTER, G. R., Did T. L. Beddoes believe in the Evolution of Species? (*Mod. Phil.*, xxi, 1, Aug.).

RICKERT, E., Political Propaganda and Satire in 'A Midsummer Night's Dream' (*Mod. Phil.*, xxi, 1, Aug.).

ROBERTSON, J. M., Explorations. London, Watts. 7*s*. 6*d*.

ROBERTSON, J. M., The Shakespeare Canon. Part II. London, G. Routledge. 12*s*. 6*d*.

ROUTH, J., Prose Rhythms (*Publ. M. L. A. Amer.*, xxxviii, 3, Sept.).

RUSKIN, J., Selections from. Ed. by A. C. Benson. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 7*s*. 6*d*.

SAINTSBURY, G., Collected Essays and Papers, 1875–1920. 3 vols. London, Dent. 31*s*. 6*d*.

SAVAGE, F. G., The Flora and Folklore of Shakespeare. London, Burrow. 7*s*. 6*d*.

SCHELLING, F. E., Foreign Influences in Elizabethan Plays. London, Harpers. 7*s*. 6*d*.

SCHULTZ, W. E., Gay's Beggar's Opera. Its Context, History and Influence. New Haven, Yale Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 18*s*. 6*d*.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

SHAKESPEARE, W., The Tragedie of Cymbeline. Printed from the Folio of 1623. (The Players' Shakespeare.) London, Benn. 84*s.*

SIDNEY, SIR PH., The Complete Works. III. Ed. by A. Feuillerat. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 12*s.* 6*d.*

SNYDER, E. D., The Celtic Revival in English Literature, 1760–1800. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 12*s.* 6*d.*

SNYDER, F. B., Wordsworth's Favourite Words (*Journ. Engl. Germ. Phil.*, xxii, 2).

SUTCLIFFE, E. G., Emerson's Theories of Literary Expression (Univ. of Illinois Stud. in Lang. and Lit., viii, 1). Urbana, Univ. of Illinois Press. $1.50.

SYKES, H. DUGDALE, Timon of Athens (*Notes and Queries*, Aug. 4—Sept. 15).

TIFFANY, E. A., Shaftesbury as Stoic (*Publ. M. L. A. Amer.*, xxxviii, 3, Sept.).

TREVELYAN, J. P., The Life of Mrs Humphrey Ward. London, Constable. 12*s.* 6*d.*

WATT, L. M., The Scottish Ballads and Ballad Writing. Paisley, A. Gardner. 6*s.*

WILD, F., John Drinkwater (*Engl. Studien*, lvii, 3).

WILSON, D. A., Carlyle till Marriage (1795–1826). London, Kegan Paul. 15*s.*

WYLD, H. C., Studies in English Rhymes from Surrey to Pope. London, Murray. 5*s.*

ZACHRISSON, R. E., Stil och personlighet i T. Hardys diktning (*Edda*, xx, 3).

ZUCKER, A. E., Théâtre élisabéthain et Théâtre chinois (*Rev. litt. comp.*, iii, 4, Oct.).

German.

(*a*) *General* (*incl. Linguistic*).

WEISE, O., Die deutsche Sprache als Spiegel deutscher Kultur. Jena, Frommann. 3 M. 50.

(*b*) *Old and Middle High German.*

BORMANN, K., Die Metrik im 'Guten Gerhard' des Rudolf von Ems. Halle, M. Niemeyer. 2 M.

DAM, J. VAN, Zur Vorgeschichte des höfischen Epos. Lamprecht, Eilhart, Veldeke. (Rheinische Beiträge zur germ. Phil., viii.) Bonn, K. Schroeder. 4 M.

DIETRICH, J. R., Der Dichter des Nibelungenliedes. Ein Versuch. Darmstadt, Gesell. hessischer Bücherfreunde.

DRAEGER, F., Die Bindungen und Gliederungsverhältnisse der Strophen des Nibelungenliedes und ihre Bedeutung für Quellenkritik und Altersfragen (Germanische Stud., xxviii). Berlin, E. Ebering. 3 M.

KRAPPE, A. H., The Legend of Walther and Hildegund (*Journ. Engl. Germ. Phil.*, xxii, 1).

KUPFERSCHMID, W., Über den Wortschatz der Berner Parzival-Handschrift (Sprache und Dichtung, xxvii). Bern, P. Haupt.

SEEMANN, E., Hugo von Trimberg und die Fabeln seines Renners (Münchener Arch. für Phil. des Mittelalters und der Renaissance, vi). Munich, M. Callwey. 10 M.

(*c*) *Modern German.*

BLÜMEL, R., Die deutsche Schallform der letzten Blütezeit und ihrer Ausläufer in Dichtung und Prosa. Halle, M. Niemeyer. 3 M.

BODE, W., Goethe in vertraulichen Briefen seiner Zeitgenossen. III. Berlin, Mittler und Sohn. 4 M. 50.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

BODE, W., Goethes Leben. VII. (1789–90.) Berlin, Mittler und Sohn. 4 M. 50.

BUISONJÉ, J. C. DE, Charlotte von Stein und Christiane Vulpius in Goethes Lyrik. Utrecht Diss.

CROCE, B., Goethe. Translated into English. Introduction by D. Ainslie. London, Methuen. 7*s.* 6*d.*

EHLERS, K., Die Bühnenbearbeitungen von Schillers Don Karlos in Prosa (Germanische Stud., XXVI). Berlin, E. Ebering. 2 M. 20.

Euphorion. Ergänzungsheft XVI. Festschrift für B. Seuffert. Vienna, Fromme. 12 Kr.

EVANS, M. B., Elizabethan Ghosts and Herzog Julius of Braunschweig (*Journ. Engl. Germ. Phil.*, XXII, 2).

GOEDEKE, K., Grundriss zur Geschichte der deutschen Dichtung, XII, pp. 177–336. Dresden, L. Ehlermann.

GOETHE, J. W. VON, Briefe an Charlotte von Stein. Herausg. von J. Petersen. 3 vols. Leipzig, Insel-Verlag. 15 M.

GRIESSER, L., Nietzsche und Wagner. Neue Beiträge zur Geschichte und Psychologie ihrer Freundschaft. Vienna, Hölder. 14 M.

GRILLPARZER, F., Der arme Spielmann; Erinnerungen an Beethoven. (Cambridge Plain Texts.) Cambridge, Univ. Press. 1*s.* 6*d.*

GRIMM, J. und W., Briefe. Gesammelt von H. Gürtler, herausg. von A. Leitzmann (Jenaer German. Forsch., i). Jena, Frommann. 8 M.

HAUPT, J., Elementargeister bei Fouqué, Immermann und Hoffmann. Leipzig, Wolkenwanderer Verlag. 6 M.

HERDER, J. F., Kleinere Aufsätze, I. (Cambridge Plain Texts.) Cambridge, Univ. Press. 1*s.* 6*d.*

HÜMPFNER, W., C. Brentanos Glaubwürdigkeit in seinen Emmerich-Aufzeichnungen. Würzburg, St Rita Verlag. 4 M. 50.

LANDAU, P., Frauenbriefe der Romantik. Berlin, J. Bard. 6 M.

LEITZMANN, A., Auszüge aus Briefen der Brüder Grimm an S. Hirzel (*Zeits. f. deut. Phil.*, I, 1, Oct.).

LEITZMANN, A., Liscows Zitate (*Zeits. f. deut. Phil.*, I, 1, Oct.).

MÖLLER, A., F. Raimund. Graz, Moser. 18,000 Kr.

MONTGOMERY, M., F. Hölderlin and the German Neo-Hellenic Movement, I. London, H. Milford. 10*s.* 6*d.*

RICHTER, J. P. F., Vorschule der Ästhetik. Herausg. von J. Müller. Einführung von J. Volkelt. (Phil. Bibliothek, CV.) Leipzig, F. Meiner. 10 M.

SCHÜTZE, M., The Fundamental Ideas of Herder's Thought (*Mod. Phil.*, XXI, 1, Aug.).

SOMMERFELD, M., Hebbel und Goethe. Studien zur Geschichte des deutschen Klassizismus im 19. Jahrh. Bonn, F. Cohen. 6 M. 50.

STOLZE, R., Kleists Käthchen von Heilbronn auf der deutschen Bühne (German. Studien, XXVII). Berlin, E. Ebering. 3 M. 60.

Von deutscher Art und Kunst. In Faksimile herausg. von H. Kindermann. Vienna, Stephenson. 7 M.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

BULLETIN OF THE

Modern Humanities Research Association

JANUARY 1924 NUMBER 21

MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW, 1924

THE year 1924 will see the publication of Volume XIX of the Association's journal, the *Modern Language Review*.

Two years ago, when the Association took over the *Review*, the finances of the journal were in such a condition that it seemed unlikely it could continue. Last year there was a deficit on the year's working of £120. This year, by means of great efforts, we have reduced this to £75.

Our great hope during 1924 is to wipe out this deficit entirely and to that end we make a special appeal to *all* members to send us their subscriptions; one hundred additional subscribers, and our end will be attained.

The 1923 volume contains 520 pages, and it would be difficult to find any review in Europe, of the same high and scholarly standard, which is larger and better at the price of *fifteen shillings*, postage (to any part of the world) included. Even to non-members, who pay twenty-five shillings, the *Review* can hardly be called unduly expensive.

Those who wish may still purchase the 1923 volume by enclosing an additional fifteen shillings with their order. Address: The Hon. Treasurer, M.H.R.A., The University, Liverpool.

EDITORIAL

Applications for inclusion of original work in the new Research Series to be issued by the Association are at the time of writing being considered by the referees appointed by the Publications Sub-Committee. The number of applications was not quite as large as had been expected, but nevertheless was very satisfactory, and the standard so high that it was not easy to make the final choice of three manuscripts which are now being read. We hope in our next number to be able to make an announcement as to the inauguration of the Series.

It is not yet certain precisely what form the conditions of application for inclusion in the Series will take next year, but as it is likely that they will not differ greatly from those published in the October *Bulletin*, we would direct the attention of intending applicants to that number. We may add that the Committee is always glad to hear of good work which needs publication, for, though at present the funds of the Association do not admit of lavish publishing, it is frequently able to advise and may in exceptional cases be able to publish outside the Series referred to.

The following new Correspondents have been appointed since the last *Bulletin* was issued:—*India:* Professor C. L. Wrenn, The University, Dacca, India. *Durham:* Miss G. Craig Houston, St Mary's College, Durham. We regret that the name of M. René Galland, our Correspondent for Grenoble, was omitted from the Annual List recently published.

The Hon. Secretary particularly asks that all members communicating with himself or with the Hon. Treasurer will mark their envelopes clearly with the words M.H.R.A. It is better that envelopes should be addressed to "The Hon. Secretary (or The Hon. Treasurer), M.H.R.A." than to an individual by name. This direction will especially be necessary during the months of March and April when the Hon. Secretary will be unable to attend personally to any but the most urgent business.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Professor J. M. Manly, President of the Association 1922–3, has been elected a Vice-President. Professor J. G. Robertson has been re-appointed Chairman of the General Committee. Miss M. K. Pope has been appointed to serve on the Committee until September 30th 1924, in place of Mr J. Dover Wilson who has resigned.

The Hon. Treasurer wishes to bring to the notice of all members that he is glad to accept standing orders for the Bibliography of English Language and Literature, which is now definitely established as an annual publication. This procedure ensures that members who place such an order receive the volume each year on publication; it also saves both parties a considerable amount of trouble and helps to stabilise the finances of the Association. The 1922 volume, which was published last August, is still obtainable from the Hon. Treasurer at 3*s*. 3*d*. per copy to members. The price to non-members is 6*s*. and should be ordered through a bookseller.

Mr B. W. A. Massey, our Correspondent for Poland, wishes to make known the fact that he is continuing to work upon problems connected with Robert Browning and would be glad to hear from any who have entered the same field.

CAPITAL FUND

The following contributions are acknowledged with many thanks: Miss Day, £1. 1*s*. 0*d*.; Anon., £1. 1*s*. 0*d*.; J. F. Fielden, Esq., 7*s*. 6*d*.; P. B. Whitt, Esq., 7*s*. 6*d*.; Dr J. M. Clark, 7*s*. 6*d*.; Dr J. F. Bense, 7*s*. 6*d*.; A Bell, Esq., 5*s*. 0*d*.; Dr J. W. Thirtle, 3*s*. 0*d*.; J. de Perott, Esq., 3*s*. 0*d*.; G. A. Parry, Esq., 2*s*. 6*d*.; Professor E. Tuttle, 2*s*. 6*d*.; Miss D. Pilkington, 2*s*. 6*d*.; Miss M. Burns, 2*s*. 6*d*.; J. Wilde, Esq., 2*s*. 6*d*; other small sums, 3*s*. 3*d*. Total, £4. 18*s*. 9*d*.

PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

Publications of the Modern Language Association of America. Edited by Carleton Brown. Vol. XXXVIII. No. 3. September, 1923.

Revue Anglo-Americaine. Première Année. No. 1. October, 1923.

The Compound Epithets of Shelley and Keats. By B. W. A. Massey, M.A.

L'Enseignement du Français au temps jadis à l'étranger, specialement à Hasselt. By Jean Gessler.

PERSONAL

Members of the M.H.R.A. will be interested to hear of the recently announced engagement of the Hon. Secretary, Professor E. Allison Peers, to Miss Marion Young, elder daughter of J. F. Young, Esq., Duryard Grange, Exeter, and will join in offering him heartiest congratulations and all good wishes for the future. R. W.

MODERN HUMANITIES RESEARCH ASSOCIATION

Observations on Accounts to 30th September, 1923.

In drawing the Accounts for the year ending 30th September, 1923, it was considered desirable to bring the Accounts right up to date, and make provision for all accruing Income and Expenditure wherever possible.

It will be seen that the Expenditure in respect of the *Modern Language Review* and in respect of the Bibliography includes the charges both for last year and this present year. The amount which is included in respect of last year is approximately £225, and this of course is responsible for the deficiency on the year's Accounts, which would otherwise have shewn a surplus.

The receipts from Grants and Advertisements in respect of the *Modern Language Review*, amounting to £79. 5*s*. 9*d*., have been set aside as a provision to meet any contingent claim which there may be for loss on publications of the 1923 volume.

16*th October*, 1923

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

MODERN HUMANITIES RESEARCH ASSOCIATION

INCOME AND EXPENDITURE ACCOUNT FOR THE YEAR ENDED 30th SEPTEMBER, 1923

EXPENDITURE

	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
To		
Printing, Postage, Stationery, Travelling, etc.		47 8 4
Secretarial Assistance and Audit Fee		28 3 0
Modern Language Review:		
1923 Subscriptions due to Publishers	143 5 0	
Amount reserved to meet contingent Claim for Loss on Publication of 1923 Volume	79 5 9	
Payments to Publishers in respect of 1922 Volume	101 5 4	
		323 16 1
Bibliography—Printing, Literature, etc.:		
Account 1921–2	123 10 0	
Account 1922–3. Paid £4 Estimated £120	124 0 0	
		247 10 0
		£646 17 5

Note:
Items of Expenditure amounting to £225 relating to the previous year's accounts are included above.

INCOME

	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
By		
Subscriptions as follows:		
1922–3, 264 @ 7*s.* 6*d.* £99 0 0		
Do. 30 @ various 9 17 7		
	108 17 7	
1921–2, 93 @ 7*s.* 6*d.* £34 17 6		
Do. 130 @ various 39 9 7		
	74 7 1	
1920–1, 1 @ 7*s.* 6*d.*	7 6	
From French Members frs. 1127.70	15 4 3	
Proportion of Life Members' Subscriptions: 11 @ £5. 5*s.* 0*d.* = £57. 15*s.* 0*d.*, ⅓rd thereof	19 5 0	
		218 1 5
Modern Language Review—Sales:		
Volume 1923, 191 @ 15*s.* (see contra)	143 5 0	
Do. 1920–2, 18 @ 15*s.* £13 10 0		
Odd numbers 10 9		
	14 0 9	
Grants received (see contra) £61 8 7		
Advertisement receipts 17 17 2		
	79 5 9	
		236 11 6
Bibliography—Sales and Advertisements		59 5 7
Sales of *Bulletins*		3 17 1
Bank Interest less Charges		18 0
Excess of Expenditure over Income		128 3 10
		£646 17 5

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

BALANCE SHEET AT 30th SEPTEMBER, 1923

LIABILITIES

	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
Capital Fund:		
Balance as per last Account	257 1 9	
Life Members' Subscriptions, 11 @ £5. 5*s.* = £57 15 0		
Less Allocated to I. and E. Account 19 5 0	38 10 0	
Donations	11 6 7	
Celtic Fund as per last Account .	1 1 0	
		307 19 4
Sundry Creditors and Payments in Advance:		
Subscriptions 1923–4, 18½ @ 7*s.* 6*d.*	6 18 9	
For *Modern Language Review*, 1924	3 0 0	
		9 18 9
Cambridge University Press for Printing, etc. Bibliography, 1923, Estimate	120 0 0	
Modern Language Review 1923 Subscriptions £143 5 0		
Reserve for contingent loss on 1923 Volume 79 5 9		
	222 10 9	
		342 10 9
		£660 8 10

ASSETS

	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
Cash at Bank—England . . .	467 11 6	
Cash in Hand	2 0	
Cash in hands of Treasurer, French Branch, frs. 1127.70 . . .	15 4 3	
		482 17 9
Income and Expenditure Account:		
Deficiency as per last Account .	49 7 3	
Excess of Expenditure over Income 1922–3	128 3 10	
		177 11 1
		£660 8 10

Note 1. There is a Grant of £25 receivable from Modern Language Association

Note 2. Subscriptions in arrear are as follows: 167 @ 7*s.* 6*d.* = £62. 12*s.* 6*d.*

AUDITOR'S CERTIFICATE AND REPORT. I have examined the foregoing Balance Sheet with the records and vouchers relating thereto and certify the same to be correct.

SIDNEY COLVIN,
Chartered Accountant.

Liverpool. 16 *October*, 1923.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

VOLUME XIX APRIL, 1924 NUMBER 2

LITERATURE NO 'DOCUMENT.'

THE 'cave-man,' it is said, is now hero in popular fiction. The 'best-sellers' no longer present a hero who bows as a true knight before the will of his lady, but one with hair on his chest, as the current vernacular would have it, who, little thinking of the needs of the state, carries her off like a Sabine, and strikes her if she turn on him and bite. These books I do not know. But I think that Mrs Gerould[1], who does, must be right in holding the opinion that this new hero is not copied from life, and that the change in literature does not reflect a change taking place around us. It is not the war, it is not the rise of a fierce type of woman and of the man to match her, it is not to any degree a change in either our character or our manners. Literature reflects the taste of the time rather than the time itself, and often the two are widely different. We like what we are not, or we are not what we think we are. Literature is, of course, not life, neither history nor material for history, but a scroll where are traced and charactered the unfettered thoughts of writer and reader, a life within life, fancy somewhat at odds with fact. But by critics and historians this is often forgotten—'to pass from the art of a time to the time itself,' says Wilde, 'is the great mistake that all historians commit.'

I.

Take the simple matter of swooning or fainting, recently considered by Mr Chesterton. At first it looks like evidence to the contrary, for there is little or none of it in present-day life or novels either. But that is only because the fashion had been worn to tatters, and the taste for it had palled. Ladies and maidens for centuries had freely swooned or fainted both in poetry and in prose, and in life, no doubt, as well. They swoon in the Victorian novels, in Scott, in eighteenth-century novel, tragedy, and comedy, in seventeenth-century comedy and tragedy, in Shakespeare, and in the still earlier romances. Was woman, through all this effusion of emotion and unlimited liberty of deliquium, frailer or more affected then? It cannot be, though nowadays not to yield to this particular frailty she will dig her nails into her palms or bite her lips to the quick. For the motive first appears in literature in the heroic epics of the dark ages, in the *Song of Roland*, for instance, written when life was at its

[1] In an article in *Harper's Magazine*, October, 1922.

Digitized by Google Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

roughest and boldest; and the fainting here is done not by the women but by the men. Roland and Charlemagne's other peers weep and faint, not from loss of blood only, but from grief and passion; and so do their Saracen foes. In the later Arthurian epics the knights of the Round Table weep and swoon at times for pure sorrow. The great and terrible Rustum, not only in Arnold's poem but in the old chronicle, swoons on recognizing Sohrab; and the poet of the *Inferno*, in his story, on hearing the tale of Francesca's love, falls as a dead body falls. But in life it was the ladies.

For the taste of the people is always romantic. It delights in high colours and in strong situations, in deeds, gestures, outcries, with sober reality or 'the modesty of nature' ill content. Charlemagne, the great king, weeps on receiving bad news and tears his beard. Roland, the paladin, in the saddle, swoons at the sight of the dying Olivier. And in the old ballads of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries youths in love take to 'care-bed,' or when they hear of their true-love in distress, throw the cup (ever in hand) into the fire, kick over the table, and go down the stairs a half dozen at a step. Or if occasion call for passion merely, the buttons fly off their coats, and their hearts they burst in three. Yet these are the heroes of the poetry of the people—of phlegmatic Danes and Englishmen. The Franks under Charlemagne, I daresay, never swooned save when they were bled white. The stout knights of Philip Augustus or Richard the Lionhearted, I daresay, never swooned at all like King Arthur or Sir Gawain in the story. All this knightly and uneffeminate swooning must have happened in story or poem alone, in the land of dreams. People liked to read of it, not because it was true, but because it wasn't, though thinking, under the spell of the moment—the blessed spell of romance—that true it must have been. What made them believe in it was only the high cause and occasion, the poet's art.

The men's swooning or taking to care-bed is like Shakespeare's women wooing the men or following them up in hose and doublet. Out of the strong cometh forth sweetness, out of the sweet cometh forth strength—the man turns woman, and the woman man—when love constrains them. There is something in that, no doubt, but the way of romance in general—love at first sight is another instance—is ever the way of wonders and miracles. And this Mr Shaw for a moment forgets:

> In Shakespeare's plays the woman always takes the initiative. In his problem plays and his popular plays alike the love interest is the interest of seeing the woman hunt the man down. She may do it by blandishment, like Rosalind, or by stratagem, like Mariana; but in every case the relation between the woman and the man is the same: she is the pursuer and contriver, he the pursued and disposed of.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

The Shakespearean law,' he adds, 'is the law of life'; and for once Mr Shaw gives Shakespeare's philosophy a pat of approval. But not of a law or of fact was Shakespeare thinking—not so women act in real life or acted in Shakespeare's time, but so men fancy that they would have them act. A man, he was writing for men, the women in the audience being few and masked. It is in the interests of romance that the men should be pursued by the women, for thus—as a little feminist once said—the men are flattered. What is romance if not flattery? and the women spectators are flattered too. They see now what can be done. In a fiction, moreover, or in sport, as in some children's games, both sexes are for the moment delighted to change places:

Teach me to flirt a fan
As a Spanish lady can,

cried Browning's lover; and Shakespeare's Cleopatra, playing a like game with Antony, 'put my tires and mantles on him, whilst I wore his sword Philippan.' In this real world, and when in earnest and with a purpose, the change is not so pretty or pleasant. By an ordinary woman no man, however backward, cares to be pursued and disposed of, nor do the women themselves, mindful of the rules, approve it; but, in one's day-dreams, to be pursued by a beautiful woman—in charming fashion, timorously, in elegantly becoming hose and doublet—or to be oneself that woman—is another thing. And your day-dreams you must needs find in drama, as in the novel, not the reality which, as you turn to either, you for the moment are thinking to escape.

II.

A nice woman in man's clothing is not realism either. Here the argument from history rather than that from present life has been employed, although it fits no better. Women did not then resort to men's clothing much more than they do to-day, just as they did not all fall in love at sight, though they do in Shakespeare. The spirit of romance, again, works these quick changes, external and internal,—but also the desire for lively and striking situations in a story, and to that end before his day young women had been freely represented in male garb both on the stage and in the Italian and Spanish novels from which he took his plots. There they accompany or follow up their lovers as pages, just as the women in the medieval romances and in Ariosto and Spenser disguise themselves in armour, overthrow famous warriors with their good right arms, and traverse continents as they seek their mates. In all things, that is, dress and deportment alike,

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

they are the ladies of romance. And they are the more romantic for being a little irregular in their conduct: the irregularity is the outward sign and measure of their love. Generally it is apparent that this disguise is of the nature of an adventure; in one sixteenth-century Italian comedy, at least, it is made clear that in life only the loose girls take to it; and so for a girl to take to it for true love makes her the more interesting. The good are interesting only if they are not unlike the bad: the romantic way is to make them seem a little bad though they be not; the realistic, to make them a little bad indeed. Shakespeare's heroines are like the girl in Spanish comedy who drops a glove or trips in the street (things strictly forbidden in the code of etiquette) to have occasion to speak to the youth, standing by, who shall help her, thereby winning a rebuke from the duenna, but fluttering free of the proprieties out into the liberties of romance. The impropriety endears her to the cavaliers in the audience, who, if she had been off the stage and of their family, would have been of a different mind.

The old doctrine, of course, runs counter, even from the days of Cicero. The popular dramatist or novelist likes to think that he does but hold 'the mirror up to nature'; his public likes to think that his dream, which is for the moment theirs, is the 'image of truth.' Nothing is so rare as realism—nothing in itself so hateful or by name so dear. Artist and public alike would think that they are dealing boldly and directly with life, while they evade it. Both are like the Lady of Shalott, though their mirror reflects a mirror and the image upon it is a shadow's shadow. And the critic and the historian, for other reasons, like to think this still more. Both give a large place in their pages to the pictures of the times provided in novel and drama, finding such even in Elizabethan drama, which is romantic through and through. But the scene there being often foreign—Italian—the historians find a less dubious foothold in the Comedy of Manners after the Restoration, the comedy of Etherege, Wycherley, Congreve, Vanbrugh, and Farquhar.

III.

Here again and again has been found a vivid picture of the time, and it has been reproduced by no mean pens. Macaulay long ago traced it for us as he saw it; and Mr John Palmer[1], not long ago, as he saw it himself. Macaulay makes of it a picture of Restoration vice and wickedness; Mr Palmer, 'a veracious picture of a particular golden moment in the history of actual English manners and morals.' With the same

[1] *Comedy of Manners* (1913).

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

premise, how different a conclusion, and I cannot but think the premise false.

It seemed false to Lamb, though in this direction he goes too far:

> They [the sports of the authors' fancy] are a world of themselves almost as much as fairy-land...They [the characters] seem engaged in their proper element. They break through no laws, or conscientious restraints. They know of none. They have got out of Christendom into the land—what shall I call it?—of cuckoldry—the Utopia of gallantry, where pleasure is duty, and the manners perfect freedom. It is altogether a speculative scene of things, which has no reference whatever to the world that is....When we are among them, we are among a chaotic people. We are not to judge them by our usages. No reverend institutions are insulted by their proceedings—for they have none among them. No peace of families is violated—for no family ties exist among them. No purity of the marriage bed is stained—for none is supposed to have a being....

'In fact,' says Mr Palmer, 'as Lamb might have concluded, but did not think fit to conclude, here was a perfect reflection of the genius of early Restoration society.' But from Lamb's premises there could have been no such conclusion. 'For Etherege and his friends,' Mr Palmer says again, 'pleasure was a wise young man. They based their conduct upon inclination, and squared religion and morality with the life of the twenty-four hours. There was never in English history a time when the conscience of society was more at ease; when precept and practice were so clearly connected.' Lamb insists that this comedy does not corrupt us just because it is so far removed from life, and because the people presented are a chaotic people—a people without ties or law or order—and that is not a society at all. Were what Mr Palmer says true, London after 1660 must have been more chaotic than was ever Munich under the Communists, or Petrograd or Moscow under Lenin and Trotsky—'which is impossible,' as at such a juncture we learned in geometry to say[1].

As for the three, Lamb says that the Comedy of Manners is beautiful and delightful because it is unreal—morality is not in question, Macaulay (whom we cannot undertake to quote) says that it is tedious and corrupting because it is altogether too real—sound morality is made contemptible; Mr Palmer says that it is not only beautiful but also highly moral, for it reflects and represents the morality of the age. Lamb and Macaulay are utterly opposed: Mr Palmer agrees a little with both but adds a great deal of his own. And why they differ so widely it is easy

[1] Since this article was put into type I have read Mr Archer's *The Old Drama and the New* (Boston, 1923), in which (pp. 173, 176, especially) he criticizes Mr Palmer much as here and below I am attempting to do. At p. 176 he says 'Had the theatre fairly represented its age, the British nation could never have emerged from such a morass of levity, cynicism, corruption, and disease.' The present essay, in sum and substance, was read before the London branch of the Modern Humanities Research Association in December, 1921.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

to discover. Lamb is here the dreamy, subtilizing Elia, as usual, and the early Victorian; Mr Palmer, the very enlightened cosmopolitan critic of to-day, who knows all contemporary literature, and French realism, and French criticism. Accordingly, each sees one thing and not another. Lamb remembers that these are comedies and works of art, but forgets their necessary ultimate relation to morality and life; Macaulay remembers morality, but forgets that these are comedies and works of art; and Mr Palmer remembers life, remembers that these are works of art, but almost forgets that they are comedies. Mr Palmer belongs to that great school of contemporary dramatic critics, and dramatists, too, such as Mr A. B. Walkley and Mr Shaw, who are enamoured of French frankness and sincerity in realism and the criticism of life. Their *bête noire* is English prudery, sentiment, and romance. They seek reality to the point of brutality. They aspire to see things in a 'dry' light; and Flaubert and Balzac, and such as Brieux and Bataille, are their seers and prophets. And when Mr Palmer turns to the Restoration Comedy of Manners, he seems in Etherege, Wycherley, and Congreve to find again this realism, this dry unromantic veracity in the portrayal of life such as he would have to-day prevail. He even says that 'the comic dramatist's attitude toward Mr Pinchwife, one of Wycherley's characters, is precisely the attitude urged to-day with every symptom of moral fervour and righteousness by an energetic group of contemporary authors.' He does not realize that these are not relentless studies of reality such as appear at the Renaissance or the Vieux Colombier, but comedies, written before *drame* or social drama was invented. He does not realize that if the contemporary authors are earnest and morally fervid their attitude cannot be at all like that of the Restoration comic dramatists—which is comic. It is the spirit of the presentation which makes the difference, as in art it always is. Here are not the words of truth and soberness—this is not the world as it is, was, or, *D.V.*, ever shall be, but the 'land of cuckoldry,' of comic topsyturvydom.

So even the philosophy of conduct must be altered, and the young gallants of Etherege and Wycherley openly invert and pervert the maxims of the received morality[1]. Here is the vein of Etherege and Congreve, as we find it in the *Man of Mode*. 'Constancy at my years,' cries young Dorimant so gaily, ''tis not a virtue in season. You might as well expect the Fruit the Autumn ripens in the Spring.' This, though far from the worst, is typical, and it is surely not, as Mr Palmer would have it, precisely the morality which Etherege and Congreve

[1] Mr Archer's book, cited above, p. 173: 'a sort of perverted, would-be morality.'

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

followed in their serious pilgrimage. It is manifestly startling, and partly because it is startling is it witty and comic. 'Monstrous principle,' cries Loveit in reply, and normal morality looms up in the background, not forgotten. All this cynicism and topsyturvyism of morality arose indeed out of these men's loose lives, but it is not the complete expression of them. It is not naïve and simple, like the knightly morals of the Troubadours and the conversations of Launcelot and Guinevere, Tristram and Iseult. For these men are cynics—drolls and wits.

IV.

The trouble, as we have suggested, is that Mr Palmer, in his modern preconceptions and his eagerness for a veracious picture of life, has, fine and clever as he is, failed to enter into the spirit of seventeenth-century humour, which, at bottom, is the humour of to-day; and Sparkish, though Mr Palmer does not see it, is meant to be as ridiculous as Pinchwife. Pinchwife, in Wycherley's *Country Wife*, is ridiculous because he does not know enough to be jealous at all. A husband or a lover is supposed when occasion arises to have spunk enough to be a little jealous, even now, in life or on the stage. Though much is taken much abides, and we are still human.

Sparkish. That's a good one! I hate a man for loving you! If he did love you, 'tis but what he can't help; and 'tis your fault, not his, if he admires you. I hate a man for being of my opinion! I'll ne'er do it, by the world.

Alithea. Is it for your honour, or mine, to suffer a man to make love to me, who am to marry you to-morrow?

Spark. Is it for your honour, or mine, to have me jealous? That he makes love to you is a sign you are handsome; and that I am not jealous is a sign you are virtuous. That, I think, is for your honour.

This is not the 'new morality' before its time; but the vapourings of one who, according to the clever characters, 'can no more think the men laugh at him than that the women jilt him,' who 'cannot drink'—so little is he of a man—and 'tries to pass for a wit.' Any cause he espoused he would discredit.

Yet this Mr Palmer in all seriousness takes for the doctrine of sex equality in the days of the Restoration[1]. It is true that were it not for the situation and the plight which befalls him—were it not for his foolish character and the context, both of which cast a glaringly ludicrous light upon him—Sparkish might here be thought to be expressing the ideas of, say, Mr Shaw, who thinks the graceful thing for a man in the position Othello thinks he is in, is to make haste and get out of the way

[1] Mr Palmer here seems to be ridden by a theory. Meredith (whom he has read) says that 'a state of marked social inequality of the sexes' is inimical to comedy. Now the seventeenth-century Comedy of Manners is unquestionably (*pace* Mr Archer!) fine and clever comedy, *ergo!*

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

himself. If poison is to be taken, he is to take it; if choking is to be done, he is not the one to do it. But that is 'advanced' thinking, not native to our common human nature, our manly but ignoble blood; that is the new chivalry, the 'new freedom,' as it were. How many in the seventeenth century could have taken it seriously—in a comedy—when put forth by one so evidently little better than a fool? We to-day do not jest about cuckolds, the very word having no longer a place in the drawing-room vocabulary, but in the seventeenth and earlier centuries—in drama or in life—men did. The time had not come for taking cuckolds seriously, for 'taking their point of view,' as we say, which, in the case not only of them but of other hapless people, is nowadays the chief spiritual business of us all, to the baffling and stifling of the comic spirit. Where men once laughed we pause and consider, and soon shall be less human than humane.

One might as well look for a perfect picture of Elizabethan life in Elizabethan comedy, or of medieval life in the medieval French farces and *fabliaux*—one might as well find sex equality there. There, as here, the cuckold and the wittol, the jealous husband and the too complaisant one, are, like the miser, the standing comic types. Wycherley and Congreve treat them in the same spirit, only more airily. If extreme suspicion and extreme confidence on the part of lover or husband are made ridiculous here at the Restoration, such they have always been; and if they argue a new morality in the time, they argue a new morality in every period of the comic drama and literature of which we are aware, Greek, Latin, or Medieval. But the comedy is the same. The reason that the sympathy has always been on the side of the lover betraying the husband, particularly the jealous or suspicious husband, is exactly the same reason that sympathy has always been with the young spendthrift eluding the money-lender, or with the servant or son deceiving the old master—from the days of Plautus and before. There is no great fun—not much of a lark—in siding with authority and backing up old father antic the law. Paying one's debts on the stage? There such humdrum, work-a-day duties cannot presume to show their face. Jeremy Bentham, that apostle of the gospel of cash payment as sole nexus betwixt man and man, sadly shaking his head, once said, 'I question whether among all the instances in which a borrower and a lender of money may have been brought together upon the stage, from the days of Thespis to the present, there ever was one in which the former was not recommended to favour in some shape or other, either to admiration, or to love, or to pity, or to all three; and the other, the man of

Digitized by Google

Original from
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

thrift, consigned to infamy.' So it has always been on the stage in this era of property and cash payment, nor is it likely to be otherwise till the age of communism be fully come. Then first out of his infamy will the man of thrift emerge. But the misers of Wycherley and Congreve, meantime, are all in one boat with the foolish and luckless husbands—wittol or cuckold. These are ridiculous, the latter, because, like the miser, he guards his treasure as churlishly as a dog does a bone; the former, because he does not think to guard it at all. And both then were more ridiculous than now, mainly because then a sense of property-rights in this particular sort of treasure was not weaker but stronger.

V.

And so with the Etherege and Congreve philosophy of conduct or 'code.' It is comical because it is gay—but also, as Lamb would forget, because it is so bold, bad, and different, because so wittily but also so startlingly phrased. It is not the philosophy or code of the period. For it is of the very essence of comedy that it should not express the code of the period, but that Saturnalian spirit of rebellion against this code, in those who nevertheless acknowledge it, which in all ages takes the form of wit and laughter. Comedy is ever in league with nature, and not with virtue. Comedy is under the rule of the Lord of Misrule—a Feast of Fools. Indeed, this is not even wholly the philosophy of Etherege, Wycherley, and Congreve themselves. And when they stop writing comedy and betake them to satire, when Wycherley quits the *Country Wife*, which Mr Palmer admires, and turns to the *Plain Dealer*, which he (for good reason) disparages, the difference is disclosed. When he is serious Wycherley is severe, and, though not edifying, moral enough. There was then a golden moment, according to Mr Palmer, of enfranchisement and innocence, 'when precept and practice were clearly connected,' and the precept was Rabelais's *fais ce que vouldras*. But England was Puritan before the Restoration, and after it; and the time when precept and practice were connected was not in the supposed golden moment but after and before. Even in that moment there was no change of faith, principle, or precept, but of practice alone. All Jeremy Collier, in his *Short View of the Immorality and Profaneness of the English Stage* (1698), had to do was to appeal to the old faith—their faith still—and Congreve and Vanbrugh were routed, and the stage purged[1]. Believing as England did, as she believed before the

[1] To put it roughly, that is to say. As historians recognize, Collier was not the only one to protest, and the stage was not immediately cleansed. Cf. Archer, *op. cit.*, p. 204. Indeed, by Victorian standards, the stage was hardly cleansed for a generation or two.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Restoration, during it, and ever after, her conscience could not possibly have been so much at ease as now when the stage (in a sense) was clean again. Pepys and the pages of history show that the excesses were only those of reaction, and that men had not taken up a new point of view but were adjusting themselves more humanly to the old. A moment —of glittering license—had intervened.

What, then, of Restoration life do we get from the Comedy of Manners? Literature utterly divorced from life, dreamy and fantastic as Lamb (on the other hand) seems to make it, would not touch us, or at least would not tickle us as all right comedy must. We get, not a faithful presentation of the men of the Restoration but a specimen of the entertainment they delighted in, not a reflection of their life and morality and social conditions but of their dramatic taste as they dealt with these; and, however highly coloured, it is a reflection of a reflection—however loud, an echo's echo. Life is only these dramatic writers' point of departure and return; it is not life that they are presenting, though life is ever in the background as they write. There are, indeed, continual reverberations from it, the looser, noisier part of it—Vauxhall, Spring Garden, St James's Park, Westminster, the Royal Exchange; and the language, the customs and manners, all the local colour, as we call it, are real and vivid enough. But the customs and manners are those of a restricted class. The indecency at least, in idea though not in wording far in excess of anything in Elizabethan comedy, has been supposed to be representative of the licentious and indecent Restoration. There is something in that. But the theatre at this time was no longer popular and national as it was in Elizabeth's time. The playhouses had been closed by the Puritans and were opened again under Charles; yet Puritanism was not dead, and by the vast body of the middle classes they were not frequented. In the time of James I there were nearly twenty theatres going at one time in London; in the time of Charles II and James II, when the population had greatly increased, not more than three or four. The stage, therefore, reflected the taste of a much smaller proportion of the population. Since the drama's laws the drama's patrons give, and those patrons were no longer the respectable element, the drama tended to be more and more immodest and immoral. Then, when Collier blew his blast, and the walls and ramparts of iniquity toppled, the respectable ones came again, or at least those who came were no longer ashamed to come. For we have Colley Cibber's testimony to the way ladies had come to first nights only when masked, and to the change in this regard after Collier's onslaught. This shows,

Digitized by Google

Original from
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

if anything, that the immorality in the drama was not the reflection of the morality of the time, but only of the immorality, and that of the faster set. The colours of the picture were taken from nature, but not the proportions and the perspective, the light and shade.

As we quit this subject, we cannot avoid facing a contrast—that between the drama of the Restoration and the contemporary drama in France. In comedy: on the one hand, the license of Wycherley and Vanbrugh, the grossness of Dryden, and the corrupt imaginings of Aphra Behn; on the other, the almost unspotted pages of Corneille, Molière, and Regnard. In tragedy: on the one hand, the violence and unbridled passion of Dryden, Lee, and Otway; on the other, the dignity and self-control of Corneille and Racine. In French classic tragedy characters are guided and ruled by the reason, heroes and heroines are not the mere victims of passion and impulse, often they resist passion and impulse, sometimes they put them down. And that cannot be said of Restoration tragedy; it cannot be said of Elizabethan tragedy, though it is infinitely nobler, or even of the heroes and heroines of Shakespeare himself. Corneille's and Racine's heroes bow the knee to duty and often arise and follow it—in Shakespeare only Hamlet and Brutus can be said to do this, and if the women follow duty, it is oftenest the duty which is identical with the dictates of their hearts. Are we then to draw conclusions touching the life of the English in the seventeenth century and the life of the French? How startling the conclusions! If for the moment we accepted them, we should have immediately to reject them again on looking at the French tragedy and comedy just before Corneille, that is, before the triumph of the classical standard of taste. The Age of Elizabeth and the Stuarts was not barbarous as Taine and even some English critics call it, though the drama in some ways may seem to be. What we have is only the reflection of what the French on the one hand and the English on the other delighted in at the theatre. The one people took all their virtues—like their families—there with them; the other for a time left theirs comfortably at home.

VI.

Another case in point is the earlier one of Jonson's comedy of 'humours.' The sudden overwhelming popularity after 1600 of this comedy of class types and distinctions has recently been supposed by a great scholar to reflect a change in Elizabethan society, a new definiteness and fixity in social distinctions which contrasts with the social democracy in Shakespeare, 'the motley society of the *Henry IV*

Digitized by Google Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

plays and the *Merchant of Venice*, the frank independence of the gardener in *Richard II*, the grave-digger in *Hamlet*, and the sergeant in *Macbeth*, and the freedom everywhere accorded to the clown.' A narrow conception of society it must seem which permits a society to change so fast. Shakespeare began writing about 1590, and did the society which he reflected change without his detecting it by 1600, although Ben Jonson detected it, who was but nine years younger than he? It would be as if the cave-man were to appear as lover not only in fiction but in the flesh, in the matter of a year or so. Only taste, or the art which ministers to it or creates it, turns about so suddenly. Really, the strongly marked class life appears in reaction against the highly romantic figures which went before, and its appearance is prompted by the principles announced—or rather proclaimed—in the celebrated Prologue to *Every Man in his Humour* (1598)[1], by the example of Greek and Latin comedy, by the precept of Aristotle and Horace, by the Renaissance doctrine of 'decorum,' and by the growing taste for the 'character' of Theophrastus. Classicism—realism—habitually follows romanticism as a necessary reaction: even with the Greeks the New Comedy had to follow the Old.

The free and easy ways of the earlier Elizabethan comedy, on the other hand, are wholly due to the liberty of romantic art. Surely nothing can be inferred as to Elizabethan society from the fact that on the stage clowns èlbow kings and have a say in their counsels, or that 'decorum' is not kept, or the proprieties or distinctions observed, in social intercourse. What is that but the sort of thing we notice in early art in general? If the comparative dearth of social distinctions and formalities in Shakespeare's histories and comedies indicate a dearth of them in the real life of his day, then the greater dearth of such distinctions in the plays of his primitive predecessors must indicate an almost absolute dearth of that sort of thing in real life only thirty years before. And the ballads, where king or noble mingles freely with cottagers, does his own work or rather the work of his servants, and fine ladies make beds for their sons or without exciting suspicion fry eels or snakes (though in a pan of gold) to feed their faithless lovers, must indicate a still greater dearth in the preceding century. But George Whetstone ought to have known, and in his Dedication to *Promos and Cassandra* (1578) he attributes this mingling and mixing up of the classes on the stage to the disregard of propriety and an effort to produce comic effect. 'Many times (to make mirthe) they make a Clowne companion with a

[1] The prologue, to be sure, is probably later.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Kinge; in their graue Counsels they follow the advice of fooles; yea, they use one order of speach for all persons.' So says Sir Philip Sidney too (1581): 'But besides these grosse absurdities, how all theyr Playes be neither right Tragedies, nor right Comedies, mingling Kings and Clownes, not because the matter so carrieth it, but thrust in Clownes by head and shoulders to play a part in maiesticall matters, with neither decencie nor discretion!' And the author of the *Pilgrimage to Parnassus* likewise (1598–99): 'My, what an ass art thou! dost thou not knowe a playe cannot be without a clowne! Clownes have bene thrust into playes by head and shoulders ever since Kempe could make a scurvey face.' Actual society, it seems, was different, and, in contrast at least, was decorous and orderly enough. Where otherwise would have been the 'mirthe'?

And what is the impertinence on the stage of Elizabethan clowns and servants to that of the valet Scapin beating his master, or of the free-spoken maids in almost every comedy of Molière? In the *Légataire* of Regnard, the maid Lisette takes even greater liberties, making light of Géronte's being in love as he is, with one foot in the grave. He gets angry, but he cannot curb her. It is utterly improbable that such situations should be representative, as they have been said to be, of the domestic liberty of Parisian bourgeois life. If they be representative of domestic liberty anywhere, it is not in seventeenth-century France but somewhat nearer home and the present. In reality this is only the chance for a piquant situation—the master fuming against his maid; and it is like the situation of the husband fuming against his wife in farce late or early. Why is it that in this farce and *fabliau* literature, as in Boccaccio, it is nearly always the women who cheat and abuse the men? Because it conduces to comedy that the weaker should get the better of the stronger—the underling, of the one above him—and that Hercules, having had a club, should be brought down to the distaff. There can be comedy in a man's getting the better of a woman only when (as in the farces and *fabliaux*, indeed, is sometimes the case) it is plain that she is the stronger and ordinarily holds her husband in mental or bodily fear. From the farces and *fabliaux*, therefore, we could not, if we were so minded, infer the liberty of women in medieval times. Nor could we, in ancient times, from Plautus. In the *Casina* his wife and his slaves, both male and female, thwart, mock, insult, even abuse, the master. Chalinus, his slave, beats him; both he and Olympio, the bailiff, browbeat him, and Pardilisca, the maid, is impudent to him and insolent. His wife plays a trick on him and thereupon takes him—and

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

he not her—to task. Can this be Rome, in the days of Cato? But so in play after play of Plautus and Terence the master of the house is by son or servant bamboozled and abused, for naught but the delight of an audience who know that he has power of life and death in his hands.

VII.

And what of fathers nowadays? Samuel Butler, in *The Way of All Flesh*, takes Richardson and Fielding, Smollett and Jane Austen, for evidence, when he says that 'at the beginning of the nineteenth century, the relations between parents and children were still far from satisfactory,' and the drama no doubt for his evidence, when he makes out such relations in Elizabethan times to have been 'on the whole more kindly.' The relapse in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries he lays at the door of the Old Testament and Puritanism. No doubt the stormy father, like his willowy daughter, has of late disappeared from the printed page and from life itself. If in fact he storms still, he goes unheeded. But in the printed page his raging, like her fainting (as we have seen), was a motive long outworn. He must needs step down and out, after the false steward, the cruel stepmother, the ridiculous duenna. In the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, moreover, and even so late as in Thackeray, Meredith, and Mr Hardy, the clash between father and daughter was part and parcel of that more violent action, and that more obvious, but more expeditious, means of effecting a complication, which novelists nowadays avoid. The father rages at the discovery, the lover retires, the daughter sinks down in a swoon, and there we have a story started. And that there was less of this in Elizabethan times is owing to the fact that the serious drama then, unlike the novel since, being patrician and public in character (not bourgeois and domestic), and dealing with affairs of state as well as with those of the heart, the menacing element, or villainy, in it need not arise in the family or the house. But when occasion arises, the fathers in Shakespeare, as Juliet's and Hero's (to take two who have not the privilege and license of a king), can be as violent and tyrannical as any. 'My fingers itch,' cries Capulet; 'These hands shall tear her,' cries Leonato; and in that fine old Jacobean mansion near Birmingham, Aston Hall, is still shown the upper chamber where Sir Thomas Holt shut up his daughter who would not marry to suit him, till she died.

VIII.

Of the illusion or fallacy there are many examples upon which we have not touched, and the philosophers we have not called to our aid,

Digitized by Google

Original from
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

nor, for all that he is with us, have we breathed the name of Croce. What we have touched upon is those extremes of comedy or tragedy which by critics and historians have not been remembered to be extremes. But even to-day it is only the best novel and (in less degree) the best drama that keep much more discreetly within the limits of 'the modesty of nature,' and are less romantic or remote. Even they reflect our taste, our notions of life as it is, as we would have it, or as we should fear to have it—the free life within us rather than the life which holds us in its indifferent grip. They show us what we are thinking, feeling, fancying, which often is not like what we or others are doing and are. They are the stories we would hear or tell, only in part our own story or our neighbours'. They too are not history. As for the morals, whether on the stage or in the novel, they are not the morals of our time, only by the eccentrics are they put in practice, and what a picture would be painted by future historians who, following in the ways of those who have availed themselves for this purpose of the older English and Continental drama, should reconstruct contemporary society from the pages of many who ply the pen audaciously to-day! A more chaotic people we should appear than the England of Restoration comedy. As for the moods, the swift-succeeding waves of optimism and pessimism, sympathy and cynicism, scepticism and faith, they for the most part agitate only the imaginations of writers and readers, and whether before or after the writing, not a nation, not a city. What city or household could be swept by them and stand? And as for the individual figures, why should the critic or historian look upon drama or novel as more of a human document than painting or sculpture? Unless he steadily remember that art—all art alike—is much more—or less—than the image of life, he might in the future, as he surveys the unnumbered, innumerable canvases of the neo-impressionists, cubists, futurists, and the rest, think of us in these humdrum days of ours, not as cave-men, indeed, or 'noble savages,' but as cripples and cretins, goats and monkeys, the degenerate tag-end, rather than a reversion to the beginning, of the race.

* * * * *

Since writing the above, I have had the good fortune to come upon Mr Cabell's *Beyond Life*, although the book first appeared in 1919. I am glad to take refuge behind the opinion of an accomplished man of letters, that 'what mankind has generally agreed to accept as first-class art, in any of the varied forms of fictitious narrative, has never been a truthful reproduction of the artist's era.' Mr Cabell points to

Digitized by Google Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

such as Marlowe, Shakespeare, the Restoration dramatists, and Dickens. 'Few persons not already under restraint,' he says a bit extravagantly, 'would care to deny that Dickens unfailingly misrepresented the life he pretended to portray.' And of the Restoration dramatists he writes as follows:

> A great deal of queer nonsense has been printed concerning the comedy of Gallantry, upon the startling assumption that its authors copied the life about them. It is true that Wycherley, in this the first of English authors to go astray, began the pernicious practice of depicting men as being not very much better than they actually are; of that I will speak later: but Wycherley had the saving grace to present his men and women as trammelled by the social restrictions of Cloud-Cuckoo-Land alone. And, were there nothing else, it seems improbable that Congreve, say, really believed that every young fellow spoke habitually in terms of philosophic wit and hated his father; and that every old hunks possessed, more or less vicariously, a beautiful second wife; and that people married without licenses, or, indeed, without noticing very particularly whom they were marrying; and that monetary competence and happiness and all-important documents, as well as a sudden turn for heroic verse, were regularly accorded to everybody toward eleven o'clock in the evening.

And as for downright wickedness, Mr Cabell observes, what few critics seem to have noticed, that in literature until recently it has seldom been reflected in its reality, whether as of its own day or of any[1]:

> Indeed, I question whether wickedness is possible to humanity outside of literature. In books, of course, may be encountered any number of competently evil people, who take a proper pride in their depravity. But in life men go wrong without dignity, and sin as it were from hand to mouth.
>
> ...It is only the unscrupulous person who can retain always the blessing of an untroubled conscience. Anyone of us can to-day observe that such is still, and perhaps will be forever, the case in human society. And, equally, everyone of us knows that in enduring literature of the first class this fact has always been ignored, and retributive justice, in the form of both gnawing remorse and physical misfortune, has with gratifying regularity requited the evil-doer.

And by means of another postscript I would, if Mr Cabell's fail me, run to cover under the ægis of none other than Mr Lytton Strachey. In a review of Mr Summers' 'Congreve,' in the *New Republic*, November, 1923, he recognizes somewhat as I do above the highly conventional element in comedy, though for the moment at least, he in tragedy seems to ignore a corresponding conventional element, less considerable, indeed, and of a different sort:

> Nevertheless, it is plainly paradoxical to find in *The Double Dealer* or *The Way of the World* a faithful presentment of any state of society; it is not in that fashion that real life is lived. What, then, is the explanation of this close resemblance combined with this obvious unlikeness? How is it that we are well acquainted with Mrs Frail, without for a moment supposing that either she or ourselves are figuring in a Congreve comedy?
>
> Perhaps the truth is that pure comedy, unlike tragedy and drama and most forms of fiction, depends for its existence on the construction of a conventional

[1] See an article in *Modern Philology* (1912), 'Criminals in Shakespeare and in Science.'

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

world in which, while human nature and human actions are revealed, their consequences are suspended. The characters in comedy are real ; but they exist in vacuo. They are there neither to instruct us nor to exalt us, but simply to amuse us ; and therefore the effects which would in reality follow from their conduct must not appear. If they did, the comedy would cease to exist : the jealous husband would become a tragic personage ; the heavy father a Galsworthy character ; the rake would be revealed as a pest, and the old bore as . . . an old bore. By the magic of comedy, what is scabrous, what is melancholy, what is vicious, and what is tiresome in the actual life of society is converted into charming laughter and glittering delight.

E. E. STOLL.
MINNEAPOLIS, MINN. U.S.A.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

'EDMOND IRONSIDE' AND 'THE LOVE-SICK KING.'

The Love-sick King, An English Tragical History: with The Life and Death of Cartesmunda, the fair Nun of Winchester. Written by Anth. Brewer, Gent. London, Printed for Rob Pollard at the Ben Jonson-head behind the Exchange, and John Sweeting at the Angel in Popes-head-Alley. 1655 was issued in 1907 in Professor Bang's series *Materialien zur Kunde des älteren Englischen Dramas*, edited by Professor A. E. H. Swaen of Groningen. The play was probably written much earlier than the date of printing, but all that can be said as to its original date is that it was later than *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*, which may have appeared either in 1607 or in 1610–11.

Such information as Professor Swaen could collect about the author, Anthony Brewer, was negative. He was not the same person as T. or Thomas Brewer, who wrote *The Country Girl* and the prose tract of *The Merry Devil of Edmonton*. He was not the author of *Lingua*. Nothing more was known of him in 1907, but lately his name has appeared again.

In *Shakespeare and the Universities* Professor Boas discusses the collection of MS. plays known as Egerton MS. 1994, and shows that four of these, *The Captives*, *Thomas of Woodstock*, *The Two Noble Ladies* and *Edmond Ironside*, formed part of the repertory of a company of players. The names of some actors of small parts are written in the margin—Gib for Gibson, Geo. Stut. for George Stutfield, and Anth Brew, which it seems reasonable to expand into Anthony Brewer. Some of these actors are found in 1632 as members of the famous company known successively as the Lord Admiral's[1], Prince Henry's, the Palsgrave's and finally Prince Charles's men. Others in 1635 were members of the King's Revels Company; but Anthony Brewer does not appear in either of these lists, unless he can be identified with Anthony Bray in the King's Revels Company.

The point of chief interest is that *Edmond Ironside* in the players' repertory deals with the same period of history as *The Love-sick King*, the reign of Canute. As Dr Boas points out, there are not many seventeenth century plays dealing with the Saxon period, and therefore it is

[1] 'The names of the characters [in *The Love-sick King*] seem to be taken from Admiral's men's plays of 1587–1603.' Fleay, *Chronicles of the English Drama*, II, 34.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

of interest to inquire whether there is any connexion between the two plays. *Edmond Ironside* belongs to the early type of chronicle play, and might very well date from 1590. The author follows Holinshed, with some additions and alterations, but on the whole closely. *The Love-sick King* is in a later style, and deals very wildly with history and chronology, but at the same time it is not merely fantastic, like *Old Fortunatus*; it has some historical foundation.

The first thing which strikes the reader is that Anthony Brewer has blended together the two periods of Danish invasion in the ninth and in the eleventh centuries. In Act I the scene is Winchester, where a battle is in progress between the English and the Danes[1]. King Ethelred enters, accompanied by his brother Alured, Edmond Duke of Thetford, two English lords, Edulf and Edell, and a number of wounded soldiers. This King Ethelred is not Ethelred the Unready, but Ethelred of Wessex who[2] was killed in 871, the elder brother of Alfred the Great, and 'Alured,' as he is called in the play, is Alfred himself[3]. This is the form of the King's name which Holinshed uses throughout his account of the reign, but he mentions Alfred as an alternative. Edmond Duke of Thetford[4] represents Edmond the Martyr, King of East Anglia.

The date of this scene ought to be 871, when, as happens in the play, Ethelred was slain. After his death Edmond and Alured fly, the one to raise Norfolk, the other to seek help from Donald King of Scotland, whereupon 'enter Canutus King of Denmark, Elgina his sister, Erkinwald, Osbert, Harold, Osrick, Souldiers.' Now Canute overcame Ethelred the Unready in 1016.

Canute's sister Elgina is a noticeable addition. Historically Canute is not known to have had a sister, but in *Edmond Ironside* the author provides him with an English wife Egina, who is also unknown to history. It is possible that Brewer took Egina from *Edmond Ironside*, and, as he did not need a wife for Canute, made her his sister instead. Elgina is the name of the wife of Egelredus i.e. Ethelred the Unready in

[1] In the reign of Ethelbright, the predecessor of Ethelred 'the Danes came on land, and destroid the citie of Winchester.' Holinshed (ed. 1807), I, 664.

[2] 'But now to our purpose touching the death of king Ethelred, whether by reason of hurt receiued in fight against the Danes (as Polydor saith) or otherwise, certeine it is, that Ethelred anon after Easter departed this life, in the sixt yeare of his reigne, and was buried at Winborne abbey.' *Ibid*. p. 667.

[3] 'After the decease of king Ethelred, his brother Alured or Alfred succeeded him.' *Ibid*. p. 668.

[4] 'In the daies of this Ethelred, the foresaid Danish capteins, Hungar and Hubba, returning from the north parts into the countrie of the Eastangles, came vnto Thetford, whereof Edmond, who reigned as king in that season ouer the Eastangles, being aduertised, raised an armie of men, and went foorth to giue battell vnto this armie of the Danes.' *Ibid*.

Digitized by Google Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Holinshed (p. 708). Osbert 'the Rebel, Duke of Mertia,' as he is called in the list of characters at the head of the play, is the same man as Edric Duke of Mercia who is a prominent character in *Edmond Ironside*. Professor Boas gives the passages from Holinshed which relate to his treasons.

The next scene is apparently in Winchester Cathedral, where the Abbot of Winchester and several nuns, among them Cartesmunda, take refuge at the altar, whither they are pursued by the Danes. This episode is borrowed from the earlier Danish invasions; Canute was a Christian, as the author of *Edmond Ironside* knew, but Brewer never commits himself to any statement of the religion of the Danes. He did not revel in scenes of torture as the anonymous author does. The Abbot and all the nuns save Cartesmunda are killed, but neither they nor their murderers utter a word during the massacre, nor is there even a stage direction. Canute joins in the slaughter, but as he is about to strike down Cartesmunda, he is suddenly overcome by her beauty, and begs her to be his. She rejects him, and we learn that the other nuns are dead from her words:

> When to these bodies dead thou givest new life,
> I then will love thee.

Canute makes four attempts to kill her, is each time melted by her beauty, and finally gives orders that she shall be removed to his tent.

There is no historical ground for involving Canute in such an affair, but William of Malmesbury the chronicler tells a story that King Edgar (959–975) had as his mistress Wulfthryth a nun of Wilton[1]. In a play *Grim the Collier of Croydon: or the Devil and his Dame: with the Devil and Saint Dunstan* by I. T. printed in 1662 but probably written about 1600 there is a reference to this story:

> Is not that Dunstan he who check'd the king
> About his privy dealing with a nun,
> And made him to do penance for the fault?

Brewer seems to have drawn upon this play for his underplot, and probably took the hint for Canute's love from it. In *Edmond Ironside* also Canute falls in love with an English maiden at first sight, but she is not a nun and his intentions are strictly honourable.

After Canute has sent Cartesmunda to his tent, Osbert the traitor

[1] Holinshed tells the story rather differently. 'He (Edgar) also plaied another part greatlie to the staine of his honor, mooued also by wanton loue, with a yoong damosell named Wilfrid, for that after she had (to auoid the danger of him) either professed hir selfe a nun, or else for colour (as the most part of writers agree) got hirselfe into a nunrie, and clad hir in a nuns weed, he tooke hir foorthe of hir cloister, and lay by hir sundrie times' (p. 696).

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Duke of Mertia enters to bring the crown of Ethelred to Canute and claims the reward for his services against his own king. Canute promptly orders his execution as a rebel[1]. In *Edmond Ironside* the Duke's villainy prospers until the end, but it seems to be a first part, and concludes with ominous mutterings of the disasters that are to come.

A further complication in the plot of *The Love-sick King* is brought about when Canute's sister Elgina sees Alured in disguise[2] dragged to his death by two soldiers and instantly falls in love with him. She persuades the Danish noble Erkinwald, who is her suitor, to save the prisoner and take him as a servant. Erkinwald at first protests because the king has ordered that every person of English blood in the city shall be slain, to which Elgina replies:

> If all the English perish, then must I,
> For I (now know) in England here was bred,
> Although descended of the Danish blood,
> King Hardiknut my Father, thirty years
> Govern'd the one half of this famous Kingdom,
> Where I, that time was born an English Princess.

This may be an allusion to an old play *Hardacnute*, mentioned by Henslowe as acted by the Lord Admiral's and Lord Pembroke's men in 1597; if so, that play must have been somewhat unhistorical. The father of Canute who ruled in England was Svend or Sweyn, as the author of *Edmond Ironside* knew. Harthacnut the son of Canute was King of Denmark and spent barely two years in England.

At the end of the scene Elgina soliloquizes:

> By Jove, I love him, but 'tis bashfulness,
> That thus makes women hide their passions,
> Even till we burst and die; we must not plead love,
> Yea, tho't be offered we must still refuse it
> With fond denial when we wish to chuse it.
> I see no sence for this; well amorous youth,
> For thy sake Ile teach women what to do,
> And spight of custom to begin to wooe.

Fleay supposes these lines to be an allusion to Heywood's lost play *How to Learn of a Woman to Woo* which was acted at Court in 1605.

In Act II the under-plot begins. It concerns Roger Thornton, a famous Newcastle merchant of the Dick Whittington type, who was many times

[1] Holinshed gives no fewer than four accounts of the execution of the traitor Duke, pp. 726, 728, 729. All agree that he caused the murder of Edmond Ironside and claimed a reward for it from Canute. The first is nearest to the incident in the play: 'When he knew the act to be done [Edmond's murder] he hasted vnto Cnute, and declared vnto him what he had brought to pass for his aduancement to the gouernment of the whole realme. Wherevpon Cnute, abhorring such a detestable fact, said vnto him: "Bicause thou hast for my sake, made away the worthiest bodie of the world, I shall raise thy head aboue all the lords of England," and so caused him to be put to death.'

[2] Alfred's disguises are famous. Holinshed, p. 671, tells the story of his visit to the Danish camp disguised as a minstrel.

Digitized by Google Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

mayor of Newcastle from 1400 onwards. Consequently the chronology has taken another and a greater leap to 1398 or thereabouts. The scene is laid in Newcastle-upon-Tyne. Thornton enters as a poor pedlar and there come to him Goodgift a merchant adventurer with his wife and his factor George, accompanied by the wife's brother Randolfe. Goodgift represents the great Newcastle Company of Merchant Adventurers, Randolfe the equally important coal merchants. Roger Thornton was the founder of the Maison Dieu in Newcastle, in the upper hall of which the Merchant Adventurers held their meetings[1]. In this same hall the players used to act[2]. The appropriateness of the scene between Goodgift, Randolfe and Thornton would therefore be obvious. Later there enters to them Grim the Collier, who had been an old stage favourite as a charcoal burner, but is here a coal miner. In later scenes Grim makes a number of jokes about the colliers of Croydon who make coal out of wood. These are evidently allusions to the play of *Grim the Collier* already mentioned. Thornton sings two snatches of song which also occur in *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*. They are old songs which anyone might use, but one of them was adapted to the situation in the play, and it is this adapted form which Thornton sings; consequently it was probably taken from *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*. It is not necessary to follow the underplot in detail. The point to be noted is that the play was clearly written for performance in Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

The main plot is resumed in an incident which was particularly beloved by Elizabethan playwrights, ridiculous and unnatural as it seems. Erkinwald sends his servant, Alured in disguise, to woo Elgina for him. Alured's fidelity is not put to a very great test, for Elgina immediately begins to make advances to him herself, and he decides that his pledge to Erkinwald does not prevent him from accepting them. Erkinwald finds them in each other's arms. He and Alured fight; Elgina flings herself between them and is accidentally slain by Erkinwald. Alured kills Erkinwald and flies[3]. The Danish nobles Osric and Harold, on discovering the bodies, hope that the tragedy may rouse Canute from his dotage on Cartesmunda, but they are mistaken.

At a magnificent banquet Cartesmunda consents to become Canute's

[1] Dendy, *The Merchant Adventurers of Newcastle upon Tyne* (Surtees Soc.), II, p. 184.

[2] Longstaffe, *Mem. of Ambrose Barnes* (Surtees Soc.), p. 91; Richardson, *Municipal Accounts of Newcastle upon Tyne*, p. 30.

[3] Brewer may have taken a hint for Elgina from Holinshed's story (p. 713) of Gunthildis the sister of King Swaine, a hostage in the hands of the English who murdered her. There is no resemblance in the two stories save that the ladies are both the sisters of kings and both murdered.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

mistress, and in his rapture he is entirely indifferent to the news that the Duke of Thetford has raised a revolt in Norfolk, and that Erkinwald and Elgina are murdered. After a comic interlude, this situation is repeated. Canute refuses to listen to Harold, who interrupts his wooing with the news that:

> While you dally out your daies in love
> The English all are raising head against you,
> The garrisons that kept Northumberland
> Are chas'd as far as York, two thousand Danes,
> Died in that bloody slaughter.

and later that:

> The Duke of Thetford's forces raised in Norfolk
> Have quite expuls'd the Danes, the English Nobles
> Bound to your state by conquest and by oath
> Forsake allegiance and with sound of Drums
> Proclaim Prince Alured the English King[1].

Canute meanwhile jests with Cartesmunda and calls for dancers, whereupon Harold exclaims:

> So was the warlike Drum and Trumpet once,
> Great Hárdiknute, the glory of the Danes.
> Thy Son plays now the King.

A nameless Captain insists upon speaking his mind to Canute, and is ordered off to instant execution, but Harold at length induces the king to summon his captains to meet him in the Hall next morning.

The fall of York is shown in a short scene between Alured, Edmond, Donald King of Scotland and Malcolm a Scottish noble on one side, and Harrold the captain of the Danish garrison on the other[2]. This Harrold is evidently a different man from Harold who is in attendance on Canute.

Alured and Edmond then march to Newcastle to obtain support, and thus the main plot is brought into connexion with the underplot. The scene is in Newcastle. Thornton, now rich and famous, asks:

> What's the news, good George?
> *George.* Prince Alured and Edmond Duke of Thetford
> Are newly lighted and desire to speak
> With the Town Magistrates.
> *Thornton.* We shall with joy receive him as our Prince
> And wish he had as free possession
> Of this whole Kingdom, as this Town shall give him.

[1] Holinshed records many struggles between the English and the Danes in Norfolk; this news does not seem to be identical with any particular passage, except in so far as it relates to the nobles who forsake the Danish cause. After Canute suffered a reverse 'Earle Turkill perceiuing the wealthiness of the land, compounded with the Englishmen' (p. 717).

[2] Holinshed does not mention any capture of York by the English. For a similar incident in *Edmond Ironside* see below.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Enter Alured *and* Edmond.

All. See where he comes; all duty to your Highness.

Alured. Rise, Gentlemen,
We have your hearts, forbear your knees,
Your true Allegiance hath proclaim'd it self
That never yeelded yet to forreign Scepter,
You have fortified your walls 'gainst all invasions
And in that circuit gloriously she stands
With kind imbraces to infold your friends.

Thornton. Our Town, our selves our lives are all your homigers,
As the most lawful and indubitate Heir,
To our late sovereign Lord, and to your Throne.
We fall as Subjects, you we know our own.

The dialogue continues on similar lines. Alured praises Thornton's public spirit, Thornton responds with professions of loyalty and offers of men and money. This scene was evidently written to celebrate the visit of a king to Newcastle, and both from the reference to 'the most lawful and indubitate Heir' and from the compliments paid to the Scots in the scene before York, it seems clear that this king was James I.

Two visits of James I to Newcastle are recorded. On his way to his coronation in London he stayed in the town from 9th to 13th April 1603[1]. His coming at that time was sudden, for Elizabeth had died on 24th March; his stay was brief and must have been full of business. It is unlikely that either he or his loyal subjects of Newcastle would have time for *The Love-sick King*. But in 1617 on his way to Scotland King James spent nearly a fortnight in the town, from 23rd April to 4th May, and the time was occupied by festivities. The feast of St George's Day was celebrated. The king visited Henry Babbington of Heaton Park on 1st May and knighted him. On 3rd May the king and all his nobles dined with the mayor 'when it pleased him to be served by the mayor and aldermen,' and he knighted Peter Riddell and John Delaval[2]. It seems possible that the company of players of which Anthony Brewer was a member heard that James was coming to Newcastle, prepared *The Love-sick King* in readiness for the occasion, and presented it before the king during this fortnight, perhaps at the expense of some wealthy merchant adventurer, a successor of Roger Thornton. It may be noted that Lionel Maddison the mayor was a merchant adventurer, as also were members of the Riddell and Babbington families[3].

To return to the play: Canute's lords assemble as he had ordered, only to find that the show 'in strange kind' which he had promised

[1] Brand, *Newcastle upon Tyne*, II, p. 450.
[2] *Ibid.* II, p. 452; Welford, *Newcastle and Gateshead*, III, p. 219.
[3] Dendy, *The Merchant Adventurers of Newcastle upon Tyne* (Surtees Soc.), II, pp. 207, 242, 260.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

them is Cartesmunda decked with jewels[1]. A post dashes in with news:

> Arm, mighty Prince, we have descried at hand,
> The Horse and Ensigns of the English Army,
> Troop'd with their Leaders like the gods of war,
> Who in bright steel, the fields do stoutly bear.

Canute promptly kills him for frightening Cartesmunda. This is too much for Huldricke, one of the Danish nobles, who tries to drag the lady away from the king. Canute kills Huldricke, but in the struggle accidentally stabs Cartesmunda, who dies in his arms. Canute in despair sets out for battle.

In the last act the English and Danes confront each other, and each king announces the justice of his own cause. The battle is joined, and in its course Canute and Alured apparently meet in single combat, in which Alured disarms Canute, but stage directions are lacking, and this is to be inferred only from their words:

> *Canute.* Why do'st not strike? do'st thou not like thy Aym?
> Or do'st not know me? I am the Danish king,
> That which all Souldiers seek in bloody War,
> May here be got on me, eternal honor,
> And easily too, for by the powers that made me,
> My senses are benummed.
>
> *Alured.* I dare not, nor will take no such advantage,
> Though I on thee could vent my roughest spleen;
> Pass safe, my Lord, I will not fight with you
> For your fair Sister's sake, whose love was to me
> So high and potent, that it did attract
> Her Virgin-thoughts to dart Love's joyes into me,
> And for the zeal due to her memory,
> Keep what I co'd take from you, Life and Honor.

In the end the Danes are surrounded and taken prisoner by Thornton and his colliers. Alured is crowned by the King of Scotland and acclaimed by his army. He is reconciled to Canute:

> This one condition frees thee ransomeless,
> That you abate the Fealty we paid you
> You shall return unto your State in Denmark,
> And henceforth even as brothers we will live,
> Exchanging embassies of Love and Honor[2].

This was clearly the most appropriate conclusion, seeing that James I's Queen was Anne of Denmark. Alured then confers many privileges on

[1] In the account of Alfred's father Ethulwulf, Holinshed writes: 'In his return through France, he married the ladie Iudith, daughter to Charles the bald, then K. of France, and bringing hir with him into his countrie, placed hir by him in a chaire of estate, with which deed he offended so the minds of his subjects' that there was a revolt. Another cause of the rebellion was his 'open eating with hir at the table' (p. 662), which perhaps suggested to Brewer the previous banquet scene.

[2] 'Cnute as then was not of power able to resist Egelred, and therefore taking his ships which lay in Humber, fled from thence—taking the sea, he sailed into Denmarke' (p. 718).

Digitized by Google Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Thornton and Newcastle, and concludes by expressing his gratitude to the King of Scotland:

> Most fit it is that we be ever lovers;
> The Sea that binds us in one Continent,
> Doth teach us to imbrace two hearts in one,
> To strengthen both 'gainst all invasion.

What connexion, if any, is there between *Edmond Ironside* and *The Love-sick King*? If there were borrowing it was probably done by Brewer. The anonymous author was a serious student following the Chronicle on the whole carefully; it is not likely that he would borrow anything from an author who made such wild work with his authorities as Brewer. On the other hand it is quite probable that Anthony Brewer, a player on tour, anxious to prepare a play quickly to suit a special occasion, might take an old play well-known to his company and pick out of it incidents to remodel according to his own fancy and the fashion of the time.

The two plays, however, are totally different in style and treatment. The blank verse of *Edmond Ironside*, though stiff and monotonous, rises here and there to dignity, spirit, or pathos. The author has a distinct idea of character drawing. His weakness is that he has no constructive skill. The incidents of the play follow one another at haphazard, without structural unity. Anthony Brewer's blank verse is mostly printed as prose, and deserves to be, for it does not show a single gleam of poetry. His characters are mere lay figures. But he is strong, precisely where the anonymous author is weak, in the construction of the play. His three plots, if primitive, are coherent, and are worked out to a climax with only one serious error, the appearance of the Danish nobleman Harold in York and in Winchester at the same time. The anonymous author is long-winded, and many passages in the MS. are marked for omission in acting. Brewer keeps well to the point, and never allows his characters digressions on the wheel of fortune, the treatment of private soldiers, or patience in adversity, all of which occur in *Edmond Ironside*. For example, a whole scene in the latter play is given up to a discussion as to whether Canute shall rule the conquered English with severity or with lenity. The English traitor Edric Duke of Mercia advises severity, Uskataulf, a Dane, lenity. Canute professes to be convinced by Uskataulf, but the scene has no bearing upon the play, for when it comes to the point Canute behaves with brutal tyranny. In *The Love-sick King* the same question is dealt with very briefly. Canute orders off to execution the English traitor Osbert Duke of Mertia, with the remark:

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Let us have fear, not love;
Man's nature will be bold where it is lik'd.
A Kingdome got by blood must so be kept,

and he is at least consistent in this. Later in the scene, when Elgina saves Alured's life, she puts the other side with still closer brevity:

Where mildness conquers, we must shed no blood.

The two plays deal, roughly speaking, with the same period in history, and, granted that this coincidence is accidental, it follows that both must contain similar incidents, such as the treachery of the Duke of Mercia, battles and sieges, defeats and victories. But it is probably more than coincidence if they agree in those scenes which are not derived from the Chronicle. In *Edmond Ironside* Canute falls in love at a banquet with Egina, an English maiden, and promptly marries her. The wedding is disturbed by the news that two noblemen have fled from the Danish court to join the English. Canute is enraged that

They have disturbed
The settled solace of our marriage day,

and orders that their two sons, hostages in his hands, shall be tortured. After this very unpleasant episode, a messenger brings news that the Danes have been defeated in the north, a victory for the English 'virtually invented by the playwright,' says Dr Boas. Canute becomes anxious:

Shall it be said hereafter when Report
Shall celebrate my noble father's acts
That Canutus did lose what noble Swanus got?

Compare with this the Canute-Cartesmunda incidents of Acts II and III of *The Love-sick King*. Canute wins Cartesmunda at a banquet, not suddenly, but after a long courtship. Harold interrupts his bliss with the news that Alured is raising an army, that the English nobles are deserting Canute to join it, and that Elgina and Erkinwald are slain. Canute is angry at his intrusion. Later the king and Cartesmunda are together when Harold enters with news that the Danes have been heavily defeated in the north. The king again is angry with him for his interruption, and Harold compares him with his warlike father Hardiknute in the lines previously quoted. Another messenger of misfortune enters, and Canute in a rage orders him off to instant execution. The sequence of the incidents is the same in both plays, except that in *The Love-sick King* Canute's outbreak of brutality comes after instead of before he receives the news from the north. The northern victory, invented by the anonymous author, is adopted by Brewer.

There is no resemblance between the elaborate Thornton-Grim the Collier underplot and the few brief humorous scenes in *Edmond Iron-*

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

side. The only parallel for the Erkinwald-Alured-Elgina plot is the lady's name, Elgina = Egina in *Edmond Ironside*.

Possibly Brewer might have changed the English king's name from Edmond to Alured on account of Alured's (Alfred's) reputation for learning, as a compliment to the English Solomon James I, but there is no allusion to this feature of Alured's character in the play.

The Love-sick King is a thorough actor's play, that is, Brewer takes a series of stock situations and conscientiously works each one in turn to death. Canute four times attempts to kill Cartesmunda and is each time overcome by her beauty. Eight times he refuses to listen to ill news, and twice he kills the messenger who bears it. The death of Cartesmunda practically duplicates the death of Elgina, and so forth. But, while he had much less talent than the anonymous author, Brewer had better taste. He did not disfigure his play with a torture scene. There is a great deal of bloodshed, but it is all done in a gentlemanly way. He also had more advanced ideas of comedy than a mere scolding match, which is the most that the anonymous author attempts. If his humour is thin, it is clean. Barring two or three broad jokes there is no indecency; in the hypocritically demure Mrs Goodgift, and in the contrast between surly Grim and merry Thornton there are the principal attempts at character-drawing in the play.

Another sign that *The Love-sick King* is an actor's play is the abundance of allusions, tags, quotations and names from other plays, which the editor notes. There is a possible parallel which he does not mention. The messenger scenes might perhaps be a ghastly distortion of *Anthony and Cleopatra*, Act I, Scenes 1 and 3 (date *c.* 1608). Most of these allusions are to plays which date about 1600. *The Knight of the Burning Pestle* is the latest identified. This would be inconsistent with the date 1617 suggested here for *The Love-sick King*, unless it is accepted that the play was written for a remote provincial town. Even at the present day a London success does not reach Newcastle for a year or two. In James I's reign, it is quite likely that Newcastle would be ten years behind the metropolis in theatrical knowledge.

If the connexion between *The Love-sick King* and *Edmond Ironside* be accepted, it provides confirmation for the early date of the latter play. The only argument against that early date is the fact that the play occurs in a collection which dates chiefly from *c.* 1630. But if it were used by Anthony Brewer at latest in 1617, it may very well have been written in the period *c.* 1590 to which its style and construction seem to belong.

M. Hope Dodds.

Gateshead.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

JOSHUA STEELE ON SPEECH-MELODY (1779).

THE systematic study of speech-melody or intonation is to-day generally regarded as a comparatively new branch of linguistics, and from contemporary treatises on the subject it would appear that the pioneers in the field of 'tonetic' research almost all belong to the twentieth century. The work of the earlier writers on speech-melody, though to some extent pointing the way, is accounted for the most part impracticable and useless, especially in so far as a satisfactory method of recording intonation is concerned. The method adopted by these earlier writers was the obvious one of using the conventional musical symbols to record speech-melody graphically, and when twentieth century critics pronounced this to be unsatisfactory, and began to use curved lines in place of musical notes to indicate the melody, this was regarded as revolutionary. No one seems to have been aware of the fact that as long ago as 1779 Joshua Steele in his *Prosodia Rationalis*[1] used 'peculiar symbols' to 'express and perpetuate' the melody of speech, and that these symbols were not, as might have been expected, musical notes—but curved lines on a musical stave.

Steele was apparently the first to reduce the recording of the melody of speech to a practical system, and his contributions to the study of intonation are by no means negligible, though they have been passed by almost unnoticed[2]. Moreover, his work shows him to have been a close observer of tone-phenomena, and it is astonishing to find how frequently his theories coincide with those of our time.

It is as a prosodist that Steele is best known, and it is in his *Prosodia Rationalis* that his observations on speech-melody are to be found. The book is 'less a consecutive treatise than a series of tracts,' 'a record of the friendly correspondence between Lord Monboddo and Steele who was a Fellow of the Royal Society and had been invited by the President, Sir John Pringle, to write remarks on Monboddo's view of verse.' In this article I shall confine my remarks to the sections of the correspondence dealing with speech-melody.

At the very outset Steele is up in arms against Monboddo, who, in

[1] *Prosodia Rationalis: or, an Essay towards Establishing the Melody and Measure of Speech*...Second edition, amended and enlarged, 4to, London, 1779.

[2] T. S. Omond in his *English Metrists* makes a cursory reference to one or two interesting observations made by Steele about English intonation.

Digitized by Google

Original from
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

an elaborate work on *The Origin and Progress of Language*, had declared 'that the music of the English language was nothing better than the music of a drum, in which we perceive no difference, except that of louder or softer.' This view seems to have been shared by many of Monboddo's contemporaries, but Steele showed them the error of their ways and succeeded in proving to the satisfaction of Lord Monboddo himself, 'that English speech is not monotonous and that it has a melody of which we have always felt the force, even while we denied its existence.' For instance, says Steele, 'take three common men—one a native of Aberdeenshire, another of Tipperary and the third of Somersetshire, and let them converse together in the English language in the presence of any gentleman of the courtly tone of the metropolis... everyone of the four persons will perceive the other three have very distinct tones from each other.' That is, they easily perceive a melody which is strange to them, but they are not aware of their own; for, Steele remarks, 'the extreme familiarity existing between a man and his native language, makes him lose all sense of its features.'

In these examples Steele has anticipated the observations of Verrier who, writing in 1909, says: 'Nous "chantons" tous plus ou moins en parlant... Nous ne nous en rendons pas compte, parce que la mélodie de notre langue est pour nous toute naturelle... Ce que nous remarquons, ce sont les infractions à cette mélodie que commettent certains provinciaux et la plupart des étrangers. Nous trouvons qu'ils chantent, parce qu'ils chantent autrement que nous[1].'

Steele not only recognised that 'our language has a species of song peculiar to itself,' but he also points out the difference between the melody of speech and that of song. 'The melody of speech moves rapidly up and down by slides...too rapid (for inexperienced ears) to be distinctly subdivided...whilst almost everyone perceives and admits singing to be performed by the ascent and descent of the voice through a variety of notes as palpably and formally different from each other as the steps of a ladder.'

This distinction between song and speech was well understood by the Greeks, but Steele is not indebted for the discovery of this distinction to any other source of information than his own ear. 'He discovered a fact which had been for ages almost universally unobserved and unsuspected,' writes Odell in an *Essay on the Elements, Accents and Prosody of the English Language* (1806).

It is interesting to note that a hundred years after Steele, phoneti-

[1] P. Verrier, *Métrique anglaise*, Paris, 1909, p. 88.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

cians like Ellis and Storm define the difference between song and speech in similar terms[1].

In order to demonstrate with accuracy the nature and extent of the 'slides' we make in speech, Steele devised an elaborate scale consisting of tones, semi-tones and quarter tones. The five black lines of the musical stave were interspersed with fainter lines indicating semi-tones and quarter tones. On this elaborate stave the 'slides' (sloping or curving lines) were drawn. But with a little practice he found that drawing the 'slides' on the common five black lines of the musical stave was sufficient to direct the voice to the proper tones; for, says Steele, 'there is a great latitude which may be used without any seeming blemish; whether the slide runs a quarter of a tone or three quarters up and down more or less, seems of little consequence, provided the properties of the rythmus, quantity and cadence are duly observed.' That is, Steele recognised that the intervals between the tones in speech are not *definite musical* intervals. These observations correspond with what E. Waiblinger proved scientifically in his thesis, *Beiträge zur Feststellung des Tonfalls in den romanischen Sprachen* (Halle, 1914, p. 9): 'Wenn in der Musik irgendein Intervall um einige Schwingungen vergrössert oder verkleinert wird, so stört das den Eindruck des Ganzen empfindlich. Was die Sprache betrifft, so ist das Gegenteil festgestellt worden. Ein und derselbe Satz, z. B. "Ich hatt' einen Kameraden," wurde in kurzen Pausen wiederholt in den Apparat gesprochen. Bei der Ausmessung der verschiedenen Aufnahmen zeigten sich in mehreren Punkten merkliche Unterschiede der Tonhöhe, obgleich der Sinnes- und Stimmungsgehalt des Satzes in allen Fällen derselbe geblieben war.'

With still more practice Steele found that drawing the slides simply over the syllables, without the lines of the musical stave, but with some regard to higher or lower, by position of the marks, was so certain a guide that he could always read the sentence so marked nearly in the same melody.

Steele's method does not, of course, compare favourably with modern scientific methods, but its practical utility is self-evident, for even to-day it is possible to read Steele's texts with the melody recorded by him. It is true that we cannot always agree with his readings, but the fact remains that we know, approximately, what these readings were.

[1] Cp. W. A. Ellis, *Speech and Song*, London, 1877, p. 9: 'In speech, pitch is uncertain, unsustained, and "gliding" through several pitches but slightly differing from each other. In song, pitch is (or should be) quite certain, sustained, and rarely gliding off to another pitch'; and J. Storm, *Englische Philologie*, Leipzig, 1892, i, p. 206: 'Die Töne der Sprache sind durch ihre flüchtige Natur von den wahren musikalischen unterschieden, sie sind Gleittöne. Im Gesang verweilt die Stimme eine bestimmte, messbare Zeit auf jedem Tone.'

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Take, for instance, his notation of the melody of the first nine lines of Hamlet's soliloquy. We gather from this that Steele's criticism of his own delivery was a just one, for the passage is recorded 'in the stile of a ranting actor.' He became aware of this fact after hearing Garrick in the rôle of Hamlet, and comments on Garrick's smooth uniform delivery. In addition Steele notes a few of the differences in melody between his rendering and Garrick's. He tells us that Garrick pronounced the words 'as flesh is heir to' as he (Steele) had marked them in a variation, where the two syllables 'heir,' 'to,' are both acuted (i.e. they are spoken with rising pitch), and 'by that modulation give the idea of the sense being suspended for the thought which immediately follows.' The latter comment reveals another instance of Steele's accurate observation of tone phenomena. The recognition of the fact that the rising tone denotes uncompleted thought is one of the fundamental principles of intonation on which modern writers on speech-melody never fail to lay stress.

It is interesting also to observe that Steele's notation of Garrick's rendering of the words 'as flesh is heir to' corresponds with the notation I have made of the words as spoken by Sir Herbert Beerbohm Tree (*His Master's Voice Record*, Catalogue No. E 162).

With regard to the general quality of the melody of English speech Steele says naïvely: 'I will not pretend to compare our language to the Greek; but as to its melody, I think it about as good as the Latin, and much better than French or German.' Unfortunately he does not give any reasons for this sweeping statement. But that he was actually aware of one of the fundamental differences between English and French speech-melody is brought out in his notation of the French word 'pensionnaire' as compared with the English word 'pensioner.' He clearly indicates the rise in pitch for the middle syllable and the abrupt fall in pitch for the final syllable of the French word, and the fall in pitch for the unaccented middle and final syllables of the English word.

Steele also remarks that 'the dialectic tone of the court and other polite circles rises but little above a whisper.' This low, even tone was regarded as a sign of good breeding. Compare the following lines from Mrs Browning's *Aurora Leigh*:

> She had the low voice of your English dames,
> Unused, it seems, to need rise half a note
> To catch attention.

Taine too noticed this characteristic of English speech. In his *Notes sur l'Angleterre* he writes: 'Les Anglais parlent extrêmement bas. Une société italienne, dans laquelle je me suis fourvoyé par hasard,

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

m'a positivement assourdi; je m'étais habitué à ce ton modéré des voix anglaises.' On the other hand Steele observes that in the provincial dialects 'the slides are enlarged to the extreme.'

He notes, too, that the range of intonation is greater in emotional than unemotional utterances: 'The tones of passion are distinguished by a greater extent of the voice both into the acute (rising pitch) and the grave (falling pitch) and by making the antithesis or diversity between the two more remarkable.'

Steele even records the melody of some of the scraps of conversation he hears round about him. For instance, while he was explaining a passage in his book to a friend, 'a sudden summer torrent of hail and rain fell, and beat into the next room,' when he heard the housekeeper say: 'Some came down the chimney, some came in at the sash.' Steele notes the melody of this phrase, and it is interesting to observe the expressive rise in pitch on the first syllable of the word 'chimney,' and the fall in pitch on the word 'sash' indicating completion of the sentence.

Steele collected his material 'from repeated experiments on his own language,' and he deplores the fact that 'a great deal of time and pains have undoubtedly been thrown away in discussions concerning the pronunciation of the antient, now dead languages, and in endeavouring to explain the tones, properties, and affections of their letters and syllables.' And he urges the 'men of letters' to bestow 'the like labours in analysing and separately examining the several elementary properties and accidents of our *living* language.' In thus advocating the scientific study of a living language, in preference to a dead one, Steele showed himself far in advance of his time.

Critics he had in plenty, and it must be admitted that he could not always answer their questions satisfactorily. But he welcomed their observations, for, he says, 'nothing can tend so much to elucidate any subject as the queries of an ingenious doubter.' These queries are often interesting and might well be applied to some of the modern methods of recording intonation. The following question, for instance, was put by Garrick after Steele's system had been explained to him. 'Supposing a speech was noted, according to these rules, in the manner he spoke it, whether any other person, by the help of these notes, could pronounce his words in the same tone and manner exactly as he did?'

Garrick here touches the very heart of the matter, and Steele has not grasped the full significance of Garrick's query. He evades the question and merely points out that 'though these rules may enable a master to teach a just application of accent, emphasis and all other

Digitized by Google Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

expressions of the voice in speaking, which will go a great way in the improvement of elocution, yet they cannot give a sweet voice where nature has denied it.'

If Garrick's question were put to twentieth-century writers on intonation, they would certainly answer it in the affirmative, for they claim that readers will master 'with ease' the 'tonetic' transcriptions they have devised for the purpose of teaching the melody. That Steele's notation, though not so accurate, is as easy to read as any of our modern notations was pointed out above.

Although the critics of the eighteenth century considered it 'more a matter of curiosity than utility to observe the accents of our language,' Steele saw further, and 'aspired to lay a foundation for others to build on,' 'so that even the vulgar might be taught to know what the learned could then scarce comprehend.' Unfortunately his work did not receive the recognition it deserved, but the fact remains that Steele in his teaching anticipated many of the views of our present-day writers on speech-melody, and thus deserves pride of place as a pioneer in the field of 'tonetic' research.

The following is a short summary of the most important observations made by Steele in 1779:

1. English speech is not monotonous; it has a melody peculiar to itself.

2. We do not always perceive that melody, because we are so familiar with it; but we notice immediately a melody that differs from the one we are accustomed to use.

3. The melody of speech moves up and down by 'slides.'

4. The intervals between the tones in speech are not definite musical intervals.

5. The recording of the melody of speech can be reduced to a system.

6. It is advisable to use sloping or curving lines instead of musical notes to indicate the melody.

7. A rising tone denotes uncompleted thought; a falling tone denotes completed thought.

8. The 'tone of the court' and other 'polite circles' differs from that of the provinces chiefly on account of the extremes of inflection heard in the latter.

9. The range of inflection is greater in emotional than unemotional utterances.

10. Study the *living* language!

EDINBURGH. MARIE L. BARKER.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

ITALIAN AND ENGLISH PASTORAL DRAMA OF THE RENAISSANCE.

II.

THE SOURCE OF PEELE'S 'ARRAIGNMENT OF PARIS.'

THE *Arraignment of Paris*, inasmuch as it is the earliest existing English play in which the pastoral convention appears, has served as the foundation-stone for the theory that, although the first appearance of the pastoral convention in dramatic form in England synchronised with the period of its maturity in Italy, the English pastoral drama is nevertheless an entirely native product evolved on lines parallel to but independent of the Italian; that is to say, developed spontaneously from the eclogue through the medium of public pageants in honour of noble families[1].

The *Arraignment of Paris*, published anonymously by Henry Marsh in 1584, combines mythological and pastoral elements. It was a court entertainment 'presented before the Queen's Majesty by the children of her Chappell.' If this play is indeed a spontaneous creation of an original author, who moulds a classical story to the requirements of a court show, making use of the appropriate pastoral setting, with an eye to scenic effects and reminiscences of earlier dramatised classical eclogues, then there will be good ground for asserting that Peele was an innovator, the first to depict in dramatic form scenes from the life of the Arcadian shepherd. But is there any proof of conscious innovation on the part of Peele? On the contrary, as I pointed out in my former article, in the years preceding the performance of the *Arraignment of Paris* there are manifest signs of preparation, not for the dramatisation of the pastoral, but for the introduction of the Italian pastoral drama effected by Italians themselves at the court of Elizabeth. The innovators were importing a new vogue—already a finished triumph in its own country. There is no reason to believe Peele to be entirely unaffected by this; moreover he is said to have been present at court during these very years. What then does the author of the *Arraignment of Paris* owe to Italy? His interest in the language, or his acknowledgment of general interest in the language, is proved by the introduction of Italian verses of his own

[1] Cf. previous article, *Modern Language Review*, XIX, pp. 57 ff.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

composition into the pastoral play. The vital question, then, is to ascertain whether his knowledge of Italian or his interest in Italy and her literature did, or did not, provide him with a source of inspiration.

The success of the *Arraignment* as a court entertainment doubtless depended upon its triumphant close with the gallant presentation of the Golden Ball to Queen Elizabeth—a distinct divergence from the classical version of the story of the Judgment of Paris. F. E. Schelling[1] declares that the source of this turn of the tale is to be found in some verses by George Gascoigne, *The Grief of Joy*, a poem presented to Elizabeth in January 1577.

> This Queene it is who, had she satt in feeld
> When Paris judged that Venus bare the bell,
> This prize were hers, for she deserves it well.

This idea was probably not original in Gascoigne's poem, for the theme was particularly common[2].

This poem may easily have been known to Peele, but its significance fades away completely before the fact that, not only the theme of the Judgment of Paris, but also the very same compliment was used eighteen years earlier in Italy by a Neapolitan, Anello Paulilli, in his *Giuditio di Paride* by him styled 'tragicommedia o tradottione.' Here then we may expect to find the source of Peele's inspiration, and, indeed, close comparison of the two plays reveals similarity not only of theme, but of actual treatment, to such an extent that it is impossible to imagine that Peele cannot have known the earlier Italian version of the story.

The latter forms the first part of a trilogy published in 1566: *Il Giuditio di Paride.* Tragicommedia. A cui siegue l' altra del *Ratto d' Helena* con la Tragedia dell' *Incendio di Troia.* Di Anello Paulilli. Nap: secondo l' antiche favole. In Napoli, appresso Gio. Maria Scotto. 1566[3]. Of Paulilli little is known beyond what he himself states in the Introduction. In the dedicatory letter of the *Ratto d' Helena*, to Ferrante Caraffa, Marchese di Santo Lucido, he says 'sa ch' io son più atto nel servirla nelle sue liti nei Tribunali di Napoli...,' from which it would

[1] *Life and Works of George Gascoigne*, in *Publications of the University of Pennsylvania*, 1891, Ser. Philology and Lit., Vol. II, No. 4, p. 81.

[2] Cf. Ariosto, *Orl. Fur.* XI, 70:

> Se fosse stata ne le valli Idee
> Vista dal pastor frigio, io non so quanto
> Vener, se ben vincea quelle altre Dee,
> Portato avesse di bellezza il vanto.

[3] Only the first part of the trilogy is in the British Museum. The copy was bought for 7*s*. 6*d*. in September 1881 from an agent in Berlin, together with the other two plays with which it is bound. The second and third parts of the trilogy can be seen in Florence in the Laurentian library and in Rome.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

seem that he was a lawyer. The trilogy is mentioned by Allacci and Quadrio, and it appears from N. Toppi's *Biblioteca Napolitana* (1678) that the work constitutes Paulilli's sole claim to rank amongst famous Neapolitans.

The first part, the *Giuditio di Paride*, is dedicated to 'L' Eccellenza di Don Perafan de Ribera, duca d' Alcala et Vicerè di Napoli,' who succeeded the famous Viceroy Fernando Alvarez di Toledo, duke of Alva. In his discourse 'Ai Lettori' Paulilli speaks of the frequent recurrence of the story of Paris and the three goddesses in Greek and Latin literature; yet 'nessuno, o greco o latino, che stato fosse, diede chiaro l' ordine, come si trattorono sì fatte cose... Imperò che non havendo io havuto lume, nè guida di precedente autore, m' è stato campo franco, tesservi nel trafico di Dei, e di Reggi, i giuochi di vaghe Ninfe, e di selvaggi Pastori.'

The actual mythological story, then, of Paris and his judgment between the goddesses, he gives as 'tradottione,' saying that he has imitated Virgil and other classical poets—but the by-plot which deals with the love of Flori and the 'primo Pastore' and that of the unhappy lover, the 'secondo Pastore,' is his own invention.

This by-plot is of paramount importance in connection with Peele's play. If it is an original creation of Paulilli—and there seems no reason to doubt his own explicit statement—then any point of contact which we may discover in the *Arraignment* will go far to prove the vital point: that Peele was acquainted with this earlier play. It will therefore be enlightening to examine the way in which Peele's by-plot is developed—how the story of the lovers Paris and Œnone and that of the minor shepherds are interwoven into the dispute between the goddesses and into the final solution.

The by-plot in both plays consists of scenes depicting a happy shepherd with his shepherdess, followed by mournful scenes of unrequited love. In the Italian pastoral 'Florido Pastore' enters calling on Nature to rejoice with him in his love for Flori. He spreads his net to catch birds for her and climbs a tree to call them. Flori 'Ninfa Selvaggia' enters, climbs a tree and, while waiting for her lover, sings his praises. Then follows a singing-match between the two, who are still unaware of each other's identity. Flori exhibits her knowledge of mythology by asking riddles such as

> Chi fu quel che cervo
> Divenne nel veder il corpo ignudo
> Di Diana?.....

in this way making allusions to the story of Arethusa, Philomela,

Digitized by Google Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Procne, Calisto, Echo, and Narcissus. They go on to discuss love, each vying with the other in praises of the loved one and of his fidelity, in exactly the same style as the conventional singing-match.

Turning to the corresponding pastoral scenes in Peele's play, we find that the connecting link between the mythological story and the actual pastoral scenes is considerably strengthened by the fact that Paris is shown not only in a setting of shepherd life, but taking a vital part in it as the lover of the nymph Œnone. In Act I, sc. 5, Paris and Œnone, happy lovers like Florido and Flori, are walking together, and to pass the time more pleasantly, Paris asks her for a story.

> And whereon then shall be my Rounde lay,
> For thou hast harde my stoore long since, dare say?

asks the nymph, naming some thirteen stories, and showing herself just as well versed as Flori in mythology, for she alludes to Arethusa, Salmacis, Proserpina, Daphne, Narcissus, Philomela, Ixion, Tantalus, Prometheus and others. Finally they choose the 'pretie sonnet, Cupid's curse,' and sing together in a singing-match, each striving, as did Flori and Florido, to outdo the other in praises.

So far, then, there are many points of contact in the two scenes. In both cases we have happy lovers, the reciting of a list of mythological stories alluded to vaguely, and the singing-match in praise of the beloved.

The second part of Paulilli's by-plot introduces the shepherd disdained. The 'secondo Pastore' enters and laments the hard fate which makes him spend his days in hopeless longing and weeping—for Flori scorns his love. He offers a dove at the altar of Venus and sings a prayer to the goddess. Flori then comes in to wait for Florido and bathes her face in the fountain. Seeing her own reflection in the water, she breaks into extravagant praises of the beauty of the water-nymph, as she supposes her to be; just as Narcissus had done, she falls in love with the beautiful image in the water, and only when her lips touch the water does she realise her mistake. The 'secondo Pastore' has heard her appeal to the 'water-nymph,' and, unnoticed, has put in bitter comments of his own, such as

> Dolce mia fiamma e dolce mia nemica,
> Hor giustamente soffri l'empio strale
> Ch'ad altri fai patir, con grave ardore...

—a detail that is developed more fully by Peele in his account of Thestylis and her punishment.

The 'secondo Pastore' now comes forward, and is rebuffed. 'Muori se vuoi morir,' says the nymph harshly; but at last, to rid herself of

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

him, pretends to accept his love, asking him to climb the tree and bring her the nest of turtle-doves that she sees up there. Then:

Giova in ogni cosa, il bene e il male,

says she, as she departs and leaves him up the tree. When the 'secondo Pastore' comes down with the nest and finds himself tricked, he bursts into a fierce tirade against women:

O Donne, o danno, anzi dannabil duolo,

and finally gives thanks to Venus for freeing him from the bonds of love.

In the *Arraignment* the second part of the by-plot is tuned to an even more mournful key. In Act III, sc. 1, 'Colin th'enamoured shepherd singeth his passion of love'—a sweet melancholy song that ends despairingly:

This doth remayne
To cease my payne
I take the wounde, and dye at Venus' foote...

and, less fortunate than the 'secondo Pastore,' he is seen no more alive. Then come Hobinol, Digon and Thenot to discuss and pity their companion's hard fate in loving Thestylis who scorns him. They prophesy that she will be punished for her disdain. As indeed happens, for after a scene in which Œnone laments Paris' faithlessness (Act III, sc. 5)—a scene which recalls vividly the picture of Œnone and her distress in the second part of Paulilli's trilogy, *Il Ratto d' Helena*—Venus enters with Paris and a company of shepherds, and, declaring that she will avenge Colin, commands that his corpse be brought before her. Venus warns Paris against inconstancy in love, and tells him of the punishment that is meted out in hell to false lovers.

The idea of a special punishment for faithless lovers has a peculiar and fascinating history. It no doubt originated in the tales of illicit love punished in purgatory or hell which sprang up as warnings. Boccaccio, however, adapted legends of this type to serve his own purpose. In the story of Paolo Traversari[1] he turns the warning tale in such a way that it depicts no longer a punishment for illicit love, but for unrequited love. Later Ariosto depicts Astolfo's journey into the Inferno where women who scorned love suffer special tortures enveloped in thick black smoke, and where those who have abandoned their lovers suffer even worse pains[2]. The same idea is found in popular eclogues. In the *Egloga di Morel*, written at the beginning of the sixteenth century in the dialect of Treviso by Paolo da Castello, Mengola dreams that her

[1] *Decameron*, v, 8.

[2] *Orl. Fur.*, XXXIV.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

lover Trottol, who, believing himself unloved, has thrown himself off a rock and died, comes to her and describes the unpleasant punishment that awaits her in the Inferno.

In cusì fatto luoc e cusì soz
Mengola tu purgeres la to falanza[1].

In fact the idea of a Nemesis overtaking the disdainful nymph or shepherd is the fundamental theme of the Italian pastoral, though the tragedy is generally averted by his or her ultimate yielding. In the *Mirzia* of Antonio Marsi (1535), the scornful Trebazio is moved to pity when he finds Mirzia turned into a tree[2]. Tasso's Aminta flings himself from a rock but survives and Silvia repents of her harshness. Guarini's Silvio, too, realises the full effects of his disdain of Dorinda when he sees her pierced by his own arrow.

Peele then is but crudely adapting a common theme to his own purpose in Act III, sc. 5, when the 'shepherds bring in Colin's Hearse.' 'A foule croked Churle enters, and Thestilis, a faire lasse, wooeth him; he crabedly refuseth her, and goethe out of place. She tarieth behinde.' Paris pities her and Venus replies:

Her fortune not unlike to his whom cruell thou hast slaine,

words which recall the 'secondo Pastore':

Hor giustamente soffri l'empio strale
Ch'ad altri fai patir, con grave ardore.....

It is interesting to note how this rather ironical and harsh treatment of Thestylis has its exact counterpart in rough Italian popular drama. The *Opere Artificiose di Nocturno Napolitano* (1518) include a 'Tragedia del maximo e danoso errore in che è avolupato il fragil e volubile sexo femineo.' The lover Nobile is scorned by Madonna Chyreresis and prays to Cupid. Rustico, a churl, enters and the lady falls in love with him. She in her turn is scorned and finally flings herself to the wild beasts[3].

Peele's method of incorporating this well-known motive is distinctly crude. The dumb-show ending with a song was probably put in to suit the demands of an audience accustomed to the pageantry of the masque. In spite of the tragic effect produced by Colin's hearse, we suspect that the poet was not so serious, for an element of mockery seems to run through the scene. It was left to Shakespeare, however, to perfect this in his roguish and whimsical treatment of Titania overtaken by Nemesis

[1] See *Archivio Glottologico Italiano*, Vol. XVI (ed. Salvioni), and cf. Bastiano Linaiuolo, *Vallera* (1520).

[2] *I drammi pastorali di Antonio Marsi detto l' Epicuro, Napolitano*, ed. I. Palmarini (Vol. I, *La Mirzia*, Bologna, 1887).

[3] See also Luca di Lorenzo, *Ecloga pastorale*, 1530, and Giovanni Roncaglia, *Piglia il Peggio*.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

in the shape of an ass's head as a punishment for her coldness towards Oberon.

With Thestylis' punishment end the purely pastoral scenes dealing with the love of shepherds and nymphs in the *Arraignment*. The rest is more mythological in character and approaches the type of the masque. Act I, sc. 1 depicts the assembly of the country-gods, Pan, Faunus and Silvanus, Pomona and Flora with their offerings, to welcome the three goddesses. This scene, probably inspired by the conventional court entertainments, has none of the crudity that comes later in the shows of Pallas, Juno and Venus. It is, rather, a magnificent opening for the play, full of poetry and bright imagery, and by giving the right sense of expectation prepares for the coming of the three goddesses round whom the play centres.

The scenes between Paris and the goddesses also show that Peele drew his inspiration from the Italian play. Close comparison of the words of each of the three rivals reveals distinct similarity, not only in the arguments used, but in the spirit in which they are uttered. Juno tries to dazzle Paris with her majesty and power as the queen of heaven.

Giunone (to Paris):

Paride, si son' io Sorella e Sposa
Del Re del Cielo e seco ancor Reina,
S' io più de gl' altri tutti gloriosa
Ne vado più soprema, e più divina,
Et s' in Olimpo non si regge cosa,
Che co' l consenso mio non si destina,
Dirai che la Bellezza corrisponde
A le Divinitadi mie profonde.

Paulilli, Atto III.

Juno:

My face is fayre, but yet the majestye
That all the gods in heaven have seen in me
Have made them chuse me of the Planetes seaven,
To be the wyfe of Jove and Queene of heaven.
If then this prize be but bequeathed to beautye,
The only shee that wins this prize am I.

Peele, Act II, sc. 1.

In both plays Pallas concentrates more on the subtler side of beauty—that of the soul—purity, wisdom and virtue, together with strength of mind and body. In both plays Venus as the queen of love, acknowledged by the entire world of men and nature, is certain of the efficacy of her charms. Peele has shown his individuality in selecting the fundamental thought in each passage and reproducing it in his own way. The rounding off of each speech by Juno, Venus and Pallas with the same words—which might be accidental in Paulilli's play for it does not occur in the third case—helps considerably to emphasise the equality of the claims and the difficulty of Paris' choice.

The last Act of the *Giuditio di Paride* is entirely given up to the persuasions of the rivals and Paris' decision. The corresponding scene

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

occurs in Act II of the *Arraignment*. Again the actual words should be put side by side, in order to see how much the thought expressed by Paulilli animates the poetry of Peele. Giunone offers Paris 'Regni, e d'Oro larga vena,' all the peoples of the world shall raise triumphant arches and altars in his honour:

> Tu sarai nel mondo il primo
> A regger sommo scettro e potestate.

In the *Arraignment* Juno offers the same bribes:

> Sythe I am Queen of riches,
> Shepherde, I will reward thee with great monarchies,
> Empires and kingdomes, heaps of massye golde,
> Sceptres and diadems.

And, as a more telling proof of her power, a tree of gold laden with diadems and crowns of gold rises from the ground and sinks again.

Pallas in her turn promises strength and bravery:

Pallas:

Me lyst not tempt thee with decayinge wealth,
Which is embaset by want of lusty healthe;
But if thou have a minde to fly above,
Ycrowned with fame neere to the seate of Jove;
If thou aspire to wisdomes worthiness,
Whereof thou mayst not see the brightnes,
If thou desyre honor of chyvallrie,
To be renouned for happy victorie,
To fighte it out and in the champaine feilde
To shroude thee under Pallas' warlike shielde,
To praunce on barbed steedes, this honour loe,
My selfe for guerdon shall on thee bestowe;
And for encouragement, that thou mayst see,
What famous knightes dame Pallas warriers be,
Beholde in Pallas' honour they come
Marching along with sound of thundring drom. (Act II, sc. 2.)

Pallade:

Spirto dar ti poss' io vivace e chiaro,
D'estrema e singulare meraviglia,
Che spreggiando n'andrai il Tempo avaro,
E sempre altere portarai le ciglia.
Ch' in scienza e valor, non visse a paro
(Qual tu) Mortale, a cui cheggio ch' appiglia
Cotal vigore a l' Armi, a le Battaglie,
Ch' a correr d' anni nessun vo t' agguaglie.
.....Questi cotanti Regni e tanti Imperi
Per Natura l' havrai o per ingegno,
Io concedo le forze a gli guerrieri.
Io li conduco di vittoria al segno,
Porgo io spirto a' Pedoni e Cavallieri.
(Atto V.)

It will have been noticed that Peele does but amplify the clear and concise statements that Paulilli puts into the mouth of his goddesses. Not content with this amplification, he emphasises his points still further by introducing dumb-show as before. There enter nine knights in armour 'treading a warlike almaine by drom and fife.' This dumb-show, so common in English plays of this period, has some connection

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

with the pageantry that formed part of the masque. It is, nevertheless, a crude mediaeval touch, added to satisfy the eye. This device is not found at this time on the Italian stage. The same purpose, however, is served by the far more elaborate Intermezzi that link the different acts of Italian pastorals, and relieve the monotony of long narrative speeches, disquisitions on love, or laments of shepherds, which would of necessity be lacking in spectacular effect.

Coming to the turn of Venus, we find that Paulilli makes her a beautiful and dignified figure. In the *Arraignment* she is more the delightful coaxing woman. In both plays, however, the bribe offered is the same, Helen, a 'lasse of Venus' court':

Venus:

Come sheepeherde, come sweete sheepeherde, looke on me,
These ben to hoat alarams these for thee;
But if thou wilt give mee the golden ball,
Cupide my boy shall have to play withal,...
...And I will give thee many a lovelie kysse,
And come and play with thee on Ida heere,
And if thou wilt a face that hath no peere,
A gallant girle, a lustie minion trull,
That can give sporte to thee thy bellyfull,
To ravish all thy beating vaines with joye,
Here is a lasse of Venus' court, my boy.

Venere:

A che il saver, a che forza a la gente
S'a me sta darli pace, o lunghi homei?
.....Havrai il più pomposo alto tesoro
C'haver si possa giù nel Mondo mai,
Ch'avanzarà grandezza, Gemme e Oro,
Che tra Mortali son fraggili assai;
Bella DONNA formata al sommo choro
Cinta di chiari e luminosi rai
Questa ti manca, e questa io ti concedo,
Se la Sentenza è mia, sì com'io credo.

Peele's show this time includes a song in Italian by Helen, who 'entreth in her braverie, with four Cupides attending on her, each having his fan in his hande to fan fresh ayre in her face.' The song is a curiously wooden production, entirely lacking in rhythm or poetry, with nothing Italian in it beyond the actual words. Why Peele chose to introduce it is difficult to imagine, unless it were to add to the illusion that he was emulating Italian performances, or because Italian was popular with a court audience.

In both plays Paris declares Venus to be the most beautiful and awards the golden ball to her, yet in each case she gives up the prize.

In the *Arraignment* (Act IV, sc. 4) Paris has to defend his decision before an assembly of the gods. This was undoubtedly a tremendous opportunity to produce a great spectacular effect. The idea of making Paris present himself before the Olympians to defend his decision is

Digitized by Google Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

certainly an original turn in the story, created by Peele. But the subject-matter of Paris' oration is by no means original: Paulilli had already put into the mouth of Mercury the excuses brought forward. The god addresses Giunone, Pallade and Venere and asks them how can they expect a mere human being to decide the question:

Se la beltà, il poter, le gratie uguali
Regnano in voi, qual sia giuditio intero
De le Tre lodar l' una : anzi arrogante ?
Et se la lite è de' soggetti eterni,
Anzi di cose sacre, alte e divine,
Che caper non le può la mente humana,
Come volete, c' Huomo i Dei soperni
Giudichi ; si convien, ch' a voi s' inchine
Il ciel e 'l Mondo ? Onde temenza vana
È vostra, sospettar, chi dir' ardisca
Di voi chi sia più bella, e più leggiadra,
Sendo uguale, e beltade e leggiadria ?
Et se l' alta di voi scienza prisca,
E di tutti gli Dei l' Empirea squadra
Nel Ciel, chiarir non vuole, ella, qual sia ;
Com' un, che nodrit' è tra selve, e fronde,
Dar può sopra di ciò giusta sentenza ?

The English Paris speaks thus, using the same excuses :

Then for the deede, that I may not denie,
Wherein consists the full of myne offence,
I did upon commaunde ; if then I erde,
I did no more than to a man belonged.
And if in verdit of their formes devine,
My dazled eye did swarve or surfet more
On Venus' face, then anie face of theirs :
It was no partiall fault, but fault of his,
Belike, whose eyesight not so perfect was,
As might decerne the brightnes of the rest.

He goes on to emphasise the supreme difficulty of the problem with which he had been faced. As in Paulilli, in the canzone of Paride, Act v, he admits that Juno excels in majesty, and Pallas in wisdom. He then points out that, far from having been biassed in his opinion by the bribes, he had given his decision to the goddess who could give him least. He was, indeed,

Tempted more than ever creature was,
With wealth, with beautie, and with chivalrie :
And so preferred beautie before them all.

Then follows a lovely picture of simple shepherd life :

And for the one, contentment is my wealth.
A shell of salte will serve a sheepeherd swayne,
A slender banquet in a homely skrip,
And water running from the silver spring.
For armes, they dreade no foes that sit so lowe,
A thorne can keepe the wind from off my backe,
A sheep-coate thatcht, a sheepeherdes pallace hight.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Of tragicke Muses sheepeherdes con no skill,
Enough is them, if Cupid ben displeased,
To sing his prâyse on slender oten pipe.

Yet this is no new conception of shepherd life. Peele undoubtedly drew the picture from Paulilli, Atto III:

Paride: Valle, che tanto
E tanto mi piacesti.....
Folte selve dilette, e gode e pasce
Il gran Pastor di Frigia, e questo Cane
Sia il mio Destriero, e questo Baculo hoggi
Sia la Lancia, e lo Scettro, qual in fasce
Meco recai.....

In the third part of the trilogy, the *Incendio di Troia*, Atto I, Paris speaks in exactly the same strain of life in Ida:

Paride: .....Ed era vita assai festosa
In Ida.
Spento era ivi il desir d'argento o d'auro,
Ma sol d'armenti e greggi eran le cure:
Ivi sol canti di Sampogne e Cetre.....

Doubtless these words helped to inspire Peele with the idea that Paris expounds: 'contentment is my wealth.'

In the *Arraignment*, after Paris' oration before the council of the gods, he is sent on his way to Troy, and the gods are left to settle the dispute of the goddesses. They appoint Diana as arbitrator, and she 'describeth the nymphe Eliza, a figure of the Queene,' and decides, amidst the applause of the goddesses, that it is to her the ball belongs. Thus we descend from the heights of Olympus to the Elizabethan court, and realise the true nature of Peele's play. Its literary purpose is entirely subservient to his aim to produce a brilliant entertainment for the court. This main aim accounts for the still further development of the final piece of flattery, the nucleus of which is to be found in Paulilli.

In the *Giuditio di Paride*, after the decision has been given, the goddesses retire, and Paris turns to address the ladies in the audience. In a canzone he extols their beauty, and fixes on one who excels the rest:

Decima Musa sei, tu che pareggi
Nel Mondo Alme celesti e Spirti egregi,
S'in queste valle Idee
Giunta tu foste hor hor nel mio cospetto,
Et de le Dive accanto
Il tuo splendor cotanto
Veduto havessi: a te dava quel Pomo;
Che più degna ti nomo
Di Vener, se ben vinse l'altre Dee:
Ond'io mi pento, e son in dir costretto,
Che tua Gloria, Beltade, e Leggiadria,
Avanza ogn'un, che 'n Cielo o in terra sia.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

And then, after Paris has gone, Venus comes back with the famous 'Pomo' and presents it to Clarice, probably the wife of the Viceroy in Naples, Don Perafan de Ribera, to whom the work is dedicated:

Venere: Trionfante e altera,
Ecco ritorno a voi, schiera gentile;
Che se ben io soprai
I sacri e sommi rai
Di Palla e di Giunon con mia vaghezza,
La vostra alta bellezza
Ammanta ancor del Sol la luce vera.
Ond' io che ciò conosco, in atto humile,
A voi dono il mio POMO, alma CLARICE,
Poi che 'l Mondo ne va per voi felice.

It can hardly be doubted that Peele has in his own way adapted Paulilli's dainty compliment to the requirements of the Elizabethan court. Diana, in a long speech, 'describeth the nymphe Eliza, a figure of the Queene':

This Paragon, this onely this is shee,
In whom do meete so manie giftes in one,
On whom our countrie gods so often gaze,
In honour of whose name the Muses singe.
In state Queene Juno's peere, for power in armes,
And vertues of the mind Minerva's mate:
As fayre and lovely as the queene of love:
As chast as Dian in her chast desires.
The same is she, if Phoebe do no wrong,
To whom this ball in merit doth belonge.

The goddesses are content to give up all claim to the golden ball, in favour of this lady 'whom some Zabeta call,' and the Fates, Clotho, Lachesis, and Atropos, enter and 'lay downe their properties at the Queene's feet,' with more pomp and show that drive home the full significance of the compliment.

The only real novelty in the structure of Peele's 'pastoral' lies in the idea which gives the title to the work: that of making Paris appear before a council of the gods to defend his 'judgment.' Yet the difference in the aim with which the two poets wrote is sufficient to give a distinct character to each play. Paulilli's play is the more simple and the more severe, and has a certain poetic sweetness and delicacy entirely in keeping with its literary and artistic purpose. Peele's is the more brilliant creation in spite of his having merely remoulded the play, and he has a metrical facility and variety that enable him to surpass all dramatic verse of his time. In its main purpose as a court entertainment the *Arraignment* must have been a great success, for it combines all the splendour of the masque with the beauty of the regular drama, while it has the added charm of giving expression to the then fashionable pastoral convention.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

The aim, however, of this comparison between the two plays does not lie in estimating the respective merits of the two authors. Such a comparison would have but little value were it not in itself the key to a vaster problem, namely how far were Elizabethan writers merely following in the wake of Italian literary men, and how far was the court of Elizabeth influenced by the trend of contemporary Italian culture? The pastoral drama, in itself the quintessence of courtly artificiality, is indicative of the prevailing mood or phase of the times. It has then a certain importance in the history of culture. The *Arraignment of Paris* is the first clear manifestation of that mood or phase in England, and it can now hardly be doubted that this play is not the outcome of a growing native vogue in England, as former critics have wished to prove, but an importation from Italy, executed with great skill. On the *Arraignment* has been founded the whole structure of the existing theories of English critics of pastoral drama. The *Arraignment* must now acquire a new significance. Further study on these new lines will reveal a still greater debt of England to Italy, one that has for long remained unacknowledged and which concerns even such a highly 'English' play as Fletcher's *Faithful Shepherdess*.

V. M. JEFFERY.
LONDON.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

DIDEROT ET SHAFTESBURY.

QUAND Diderot atteint l'âge d'homme, la France porte toute son attention sur l'Angleterre. Il n'est pas un philosophe qui ne subisse plus ou moins l'influence de la pensée anglaise et qui ne séjourne plus ou moins longtemps en Angleterre. Voltaire y est exilé de 1726 à 1729, et l'on sait quelle impression la vie anglaise tout entière laissa sur lui. Montesquieu y reste près de deux ans, rempli d'admiration pour la constitution anglaise, dans laquelle il n'est pas loin de voir l'idéal du gouvernement. Buffon y fait un voyage avec un jeune lord anglais. Holbach, Helvétius, Rousseau même, ne résistent pas à l'attrait que l'Angleterre à cette époque exerce sur tous les Français.

Seul Diderot, parmi les philosophes, n'alla pas visiter l'Angleterre. A part son voyage en Russie—et il ne fallut rien moins que la brillante personnalité, le charme et la générosité de Catherine II pour le décider à quitter la France—il resta à Paris dans son 'réduit philosophique' de la rue de l'Observatoire ou de la rue Taranne, heureux, comme il le dit, 'dans sa vieille robe de chambre, avec sa chaise de paille, sa table de bois, sa planche de sapin qui soutenait quelques livres, quelques estampes enfumées et trois ou quatre plâtres suspendus qui formaient avec sa vieille robe de chambre l'indigence la plus harmonieuse.'

Si l'on se demande pour quelles raisons Diderot ne suivit pas l'exemple des autres philosophes, il faut voir là, sans doute, l'effet de son indigence, de sa 'médiocrité,' comme il se plaisait aussi à nommer cette indigence. Il faut voir là, surtout, l'effet de son aversion pour les voyages. 'C'est une belle chose que les voyages, écrit-il dans le *Salon de 1767*, mais il faut avoir perdu son père, sa mère, ses enfants, ses amis, ou n'en avoir jamais eu, pour errer, par état, sur la surface du globe. Que diriez-vous du propriétaire d'un palais immense, qui emploierait toute sa vie à monter et à descendre des caves aux greniers, des greniers aux caves, au lieu de s'asseoir tranquillement au centre de sa famille?' Ou, comme il l'écrivait à la fin du *Voyage autour du monde*, 'Jusqu'à présent le dernier résultat de mes réflexions a toujours été qu'on n'était nulle part mieux que chez soi.'

Ce séjour presque ininterrompu en France n'empêcha point Diderot de subir l'influence anglaise. A vrai dire, on ne peut guère trouver dans la vie de Diderot, une période où il n'ait vécu un livre anglais à la

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

main. Son premier ouvrage, paru en 1743, l'année de son mariage, est une traduction de *The Grecian History* de Temple Stanyan. Peu de temps après, il entreprend, avec deux littérateurs faméliques et un médecin breton, la traduction de l'énorme dictionnaire de Robert James, *A Medical Dictionary, including Physic, Surgery, Anatomy, Chymistry, and Botany, in all their Branches relative to Medicine, together with a History of Drugs, etc....* En 1751, il revise la traduction de l'*Inquiry concerning Human Understanding* de Hume, faite par Mademoiselle de la Chaux. Tantôt, c'est *The Religion of Nature delineated* de Wollaston qui devient chez Diderot *De la Suffisance de la Religion naturelle*, ou les *Thoughts on the Interpretation of Nature* de Bacon qui servent de base à ses *Pensées sur l'Interprétation de la Nature.* Tantôt, c'est l'influence de Richardson que l'on trouve dans *La Religieuse*, l'influence de Garrick dans *Le Paradoxe sur le Comédien*, l'influence de Sterne dans *Jacques le Fataliste*; influences si nombreuses et parfois si profondes que Brutenière n'hésitait pas à écrire à son sujet: 'Si l'on disait qu'il fut tout anglais, on serait assez près de la vérité.'

Parmi ces diverses influences, une semble être plus particulièrement importante, ne serait-ce que parce qu'elle fut la première que subit Diderot, et qu'il en porta longtemps la marque: l'influence de Shaftesbury. C'est, en effet, par une traduction de *An Inquiry concerning Virtue or Merit* de Shaftesbury, que Diderot, à l'âge de trente-deux ans, fit son entrée dans la carrière de lettres.

A l'en croire, cet *Essai sur le Mérite et la Vertu* serait, d'ailleurs, à peine une traduction. 'Il ne me reste qu'un mot à dire, écrit-il dans le Discours Préliminaire, sur la manière dont j'ai traité M(ylord) S(haftesbury). Je l'ai lu et relu; je me suis rempli de son esprit; et j'ai, pour ainsi dire, fermé son livre, lorsque j'ai pris la plume.... J'ai resserré ce qui m'a paru trop diffus, étendu ce qui m'a paru trop serré, rectifié ce qui n'était pensé qu'avec hardiesse; et les réflexions qui accompagnent cette espèce de texte sont si fréquentes, que l'Essai de M... S... qui n'était proprement qu'une démonstration métaphysique, s'est converti en éléments de morale assez considérables.' Il suffit de comparer l'original anglais et la traduction pour se rendre compte que Diderot n'a point, même 'pour ainsi dire,' fermé le livre quand il a pris la plume. Il a traduit le texte librement, prenant plaisir à donner, dans la mesure du possible, une forme plus personnelle à des idées qu'il faisait siennes, ou, à plus justement parler, qu'il découvrait en lui à mesure qu'il les traduisait.

La fille et biographe de Diderot, Mme de Vandeul, raconte dans ses

Digitized by Google Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Mémoires sur Diderot comment il fut amené à publier cet *Essai*. Diderot avait pour maîtresse Mme de Puisieux. 'Mme de Puisieux, dit-elle, était pauvre; elle demanda de l'argent à mon père; il publia l'Essai sur le Mérite et la Vertu, vendit cet ouvrage cinquante louis et les lui porta.' Il faut se garder d'ajouter foi à tout ce que raconte Mme de Vandeul sur son père, et rien n'est moins avéré que l'exactitude de ce passage. En admettant même que ce récit soit conforme à la réalité, il n'en resterait pas moins à expliquer pourquoi Diderot fut attiré par Shaftesbury plutôt que par tout autre écrivain anglais.

Il y a de ce choix plusieurs raisons. D'abord, au moment où Diderot, en 1745, n'avait encore donné que sa traduction de l'*Histoire de la Grèce* de Temple Stanyan, et où il travaillait à sa traduction du *Dictionnaire de Médecine*, les *Characteristics* de Shaftesbury avaient acquis une réputation européenne. Pour nous en tenir à la France, qui seule ici nous intéresse, dès 1709, la *Letter concerning Enthusiasm* de Shaftesbury, publiée en 1708, avait été traduite en français et examinée par Le Clerc dans la *Bibliothèque Choisie*. En 1710 avait paru la traduction de *An Essay on the Freedom of Wit and Humour*, sous le titre d'*Essai sur l'Usage de la Raillerie et de l'Enjouement dans la Conversation*. Voltaire, en 1734, écrivait dans sa vingt-deuxième Lettre Philosophique, au sujet de l'*Essay on Man* de Pope: 'L'essai me paraît le plus beau poème didactique...qu'on ait jamais écrit.... Il est vrai que le fond s'en trouve tout entier dans les Caractéristiques du Lord Shaftesbury.' Mieux encore, en 1744, un an avant que Diderot ne publiât sa traduction de l'*Inquiry concerning Virtue or Merit*, cet essai avait été traduit par un M. Paillet sous le titre de *Principes de la philosophie morale, ou Essai de M... S... sur le Mérite et la Vertu*.

De plus, comme l'a montré Lord Morley dans son *Diderot and the Encyclopaedists* (vol. I, p. 48), un besoin de raison, de bon sens se faisait sentir en France. D'une part, les extravagances, les crises d'hystérie religieuse, les miracles qui eurent lieu à Paris parmi les Jansénistes entre 1727 et 1758, les tortures que s'infligèrent hommes et femmes dans l'espoir d'attirer la grâce divine ramenèrent les esprits au bon sens et à la raison. D'autre part, les débats violents et prolongés, les intrigues, les tergiversations auxquels donna lieu la promulgation de la bulle *Unigenitus* enseignèrent aux observateurs placides combien peu de respect méritent les questions importantes que l'Église universelle prétend avoir résolues. Pour combattre les extravagances et l'hystérie des Jansénistes, aussi bien que les prétensions factieuses de leurs rivaux, une arme s'offrait, et une seule: le bon sens. Or, Shaftesbury avait précisément pris le bon sens comme principe philosophique.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Enfin, Diderot trouvait dans Shaftesbury ce qu'il n'avait trouvé ni dans Cicéron, ni dans Sénèque, ni dans Montaigne, et ce qu'il cherchait, subconsciemment peut-être, mais non moins avidement: un système de morale basé sur la raison, une application du rationalisme aux questions d'éthique. 'Nous ne manquons pas de longs traités de morale, dit-il dans son Discours Préliminaire, mais on n'a point encore pensé à nous en donner des éléments.... La science des mœurs faisait la partie principale de la philosophie des Anciens, en cela ce me semble beaucoup plus sages que nous.... Il faut espérer que ces professeurs éclairés qui ont purgé la logique des universaux et des catégories...seront frappés de ce défaut et ne refuseront pas à la morale quelques-unes de ces veilles qu'ils consacrent au bien public. Heureux si cet essai trouve place dans la multitude des matériaux qu'ils rassembleront.'

Or, qu'enseignait Shaftesbury dans son *Inquiry concerning Virtue or Merit*? D'abord, dit Shaftesbury, la religion et la vertu, qui, sans doute, sont unies par beaucoup de rapports, ne sont point inséparables. Ce qui importe chez un homme n'est point sa dévotion mais bien sa probité. Notre sentiment de droiture et d'injustice est inné; il peut être altéré ou obscurci par les religions, aussi l'athéisme est-il moins redoutable que la superstition qui a toujours donné lieu à des persécutions. Enfin, la croyance que la sagesse universelle gouverne cet univers et qu'elle a lié l'intérêt de la créature au bien général était pour Shaftesbury la meilleure base pour la vertu. 'La vertu, cette qualité avantageuse à toute société, fait aussi l'intérêt réel et le bonheur présent de chaque créature en particulier.'

A l'optimisme, à l'utilitarisme qui formait la base de cette éthique, Shaftesbury joignait le théisme: la croyance à un 'être tout puissant dans la nature et qu'on suppose la gouverner avec intelligence.'

Toutes ces idées étaient celles de Diderot, au point qu'il s'émerveilla sans doute de les trouver déjà toutes formulées chez Shaftesbury, et qu'il put croire, lorsqu'il eut traduit le livre, avoir 'pour ainsi dire fermé son livre quand il prit la plume.' Diderot n'osa cependant point traduire l'*Essai sur le Mérite* sans prendre des précautions oratoires, sans modifier ou tempérer quelques passages, sans retrancher ou transformer certaines expressions. Alors que dans sa *Réfutation de l'ouvrage d'Helvétius intitulé l'Homme* Diderot devait écrire: 'Je hais tous les oints du Seigneur sous quelque titre que ce soit,' il n'osa traduire 'the rich foundations of easy and pampered priests' que par 'les communautés opulentes de dervis oiseux.' Alors que dans le même passage de la *Réfutation* il devait écrire: 'Dieu est une mauvaise machine dont on ne peut rien

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

faire qui vaille...il ne faut ni prêtres ni dieux,' dans son *Discours Préliminaire* de l'*Essai sur le Mérite*, il prit grand soin de déclarer que cet *Essai* n'était point dirigé contre la religion, que le théiste n'est point le déiste, et il défendit Shaftesbury contre tout soupçon d'impiété.

Malgré ces modifications, ces précautions et ces tempéraments, Diderot n'en était pas moins entièrement d'accord avec Shaftesbury. Tous deux attribuaient à l'éthique une importance beaucoup plus considérable qu'à la métaphysique. Tous deux condamnaient le fanatisme, 'l'enthousiasme' comme l'avait appelé Shaftesbury dans son *Letter concerning Enthusiasm*. Tous deux admiraient au-dessus de tout la vertu, une vertu païenne par opposition à la vertu religieuse. Tous deux enfin avaient une haine profonde pour l'esprit religieux et pour les prêtres. Et, si Diderot avait gardé dans son *Essai sur le Mérite* ce qu'on a appelé un déisme de transition, il devait bientôt s'en débarrasser et se rapprocher plus encore de la pensée de Shaftesbury.

Encouragé par le succès de l'*Essai sur le Mérite*, sûr de sa vente s'il publiait un livre dans le même esprit, Diderot, en 1747, fit paraître ses *Pensées philosophiques*. Elles furent composées, nous dit Mme de Vandeul, du Vendredi saint au jour de Pâques, et vendues cinquante louis pour satisfaire à une nouvelle demande d'argent de Mme de Puisieux. Ces pensées, quand elles ne sont pas tirées de Cicéron ou de Montaigne, sont directement inspirées et quelquefois entièrement fournies par les *Caractéristiques* de Shaftesbury. Quelques exemples suffiront à illustrer ce point.

Shaftesbury dans son *Letter concerning Enthusiasm* développait cette pensée déjà exprimée par Bacon: 'It were better to have no opinion of God at all than such an opinion as is unworthy of him; for the one is unbelief, the other is contumely; and certainly superstition is the reproach of the Deity,' et il ajoutait dans une note: 'For my own part, says honest Plutarch, I had rather men should say of me, That there neither is nor ever was such a one as Plutarch; than they should say, There was a Plutarch, an unsteady, changeable, easily provokable, and revengeful man, *ἄνθρωπος ἀβέβαιος, εὐμετάβολος, εὐχερὴς πρὸς ὀργήν, μικρόλυπος*, etc. Plutarch, *de Superstitione*.' Diderot transporte le tout dans sa Pensée XII: 'Oui, je le soutiens, la superstition est plus injurieuse à Dieu que l'athéisme. J'aimerais mieux, dit Plutarque, qu'on pensât qu'il n'y eut jamais de Plutarque au monde, que de croire que Plutarque est injuste, colère, inconstant, jaloux, vindicatif, et tel qu'il serait bien fâché d'être.'

Dans *The Moralists* Shaftesbury avait écrit: 'The word or name of

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

atheist may possibly occasion some disturbance, by being made to describe two characters so very different as his who absolutely denies and his who only doubts. Now he who doubts may possibly lament his own unhappiness and wish to be convinced. He who denies is daringly presumptuous, and sets up an opinion against the interest of mankind and being of society.' Diderot dira dans sa Pensée XXII : 'Je distingue les athées en trois classes. Il y en a quelques-uns qui vous disent nettement qu'il n'y a point de Dieu, et qui le pensent : ce sont les vrais athées ; un assez grand nombre, qui ne savent qu'en penser, et qui décideraient volontiers la question à croix ou pile : ce sont les athées sceptiques ; beaucoup plus qui voudraient qu'il n'y en eu point, qui font semblant d'en être persuadés, qui vivent comme s'ils l'étaient : ce sont les fanfarons du parti.'

De même dans les passages suivants :

SHAFTESBURY	DIDEROT
Thus the generous and mild Emperor, whom we may indeed call heathen, but not so justly apostate, since being at different times of his youth transferred to different schools or universities, and bred under tutors of each religion, as well heathen as Christian, he happened, when of full age, to make his choice (though very unfortunately) in the former kind and adhered to the ancient religion of his country and forefathers. (*Miscellaneous Reflections*, p. 212, note.)	Tels étaient les sentiments de ce prince, à qui l'on peut reprocher le paganisme, mais non l'apostasie : il passa les premières années de sa vie sous différents maîtres, et dans différentes écoles ; et fit, dans un âge plus avancé, un choix infortuné : il se décida malheureusement pour le culte de ses aïeux, et les dieux de son pays. (Pensée XLIII.)
The famed Gregorius...carried on a kind of general massacre upon every product of human wit...betraying his inveterate hatred to ancient learning, as well as the natural effect of this zealot-passion, in his own barbarity.... His words are : I do not shun barbarisms ; I despise rules about the position or the cases of prepositions, for I strongly hold it to be unfitting to bind the words of heaven by the rules of Donatus. (*Ibid.*, p. 304, note.)	C'est apparemment de ses prédécesseurs que saint Grégoire le Grand avait hérité le zèle barbare qui l'anima contre les lettres et les arts. S'il n'eût tenu qu'à ce pontife, nous serions dans le cas des mahométans, qui en sont réduits pour toute lecture à celle de leur Alcoran. Car, quel eût été le sort des anciens écrivains, entre les mains d'un homme qui solécisait par principe de religion ; qui s'imaginait qu'observer les règles de la grammaire, c'était soumettre Jésus-Christ à Donat ? (Pensée XLIV.)
I have seen, in certain Christian churches, an ancient piece or two, affirmed...'to have been angelically and divinely wrought by a supernatural hand and sacred pencil.' Had the piece happened to be of a hand like Raphael's I could have found nothing certain to oppose to this tradition. But having observed the whole style and manner of the pretended heavenly workmanship to be	On conserve dans nos églises des tableaux qu'on nous assure avoir été peints par des anges et par la Divinité même : si ces morceaux étaient sortis de la main de Le Sueur ou de Le Brun, que pourrais-je opposer à cette tradition immémoriale ? Rien du tout, peut-être. Mais quand j'observe ces célestes ouvrages, et que je vois à chaque pas les règles de la peinture violées dans le dessin et dans l'exécution,

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

so indifferent as to vary in many particulars from the truth of art, I presumed within myself to beg pardon of the tradition and assert confidently, 'that if the pencil had been heaven-guided it could never have been so lame in its performance.' (*Ibid.*, p. 298.)

le vrai de l'art abandonné partout, ne pouvant supposer que l'ouvrier était un ignorant, il faut bien que j'accuse la tradition d'être fabuleuse. (Pensée XLV.)

On pourrait encore trouver quelques traces de l'influence de Shaftesbury sur Diderot dans *La promenade du Sceptique* et dans *Les Entretiens sur le Fils Naturel*, qui tous deux, par certains côtés, rappellent quelques pages des *Moralists*. Il n'y a pas lieu, cependant, de s'arrêter à l'étude de ces traces. Elles ne nous apprendraient rien de plus sur l'influence de Shaftesbury sur Diderot.

Après avoir avec Shaftesbury condamné le fanatisme, lutté contre l'esprit religieux, établi une morale sociale et fondé le bonheur sur la vertu, Diderot, dans sa vieillesse, loin de l'optimisme sur lequel Shaftesbury avait fondé sa philosophie de la vie, revenait au problème qui l'avait si longtemps occupé, et écrivait: 'J'étais bien jeune lorsqu'il me vint en tête que la morale entière consistait à prouver aux hommes qu'après tout, pour être heureux, on n'avait rien de mieux à faire dans ce monde que d'être vertueux; tout de suite je me mis à méditer cette question, et je la médite encore. Voulez-vous que je vous dise un beau paradoxe? C'est que je suis convaincu qu'il ne peut y avoir de vrai bonheur pour l'espèce humaine que dans un état social où il n'y aurait ni roi, ni magistrat, ni prêtre, ni lois, ni tien, ni mien, ni propriété mobilière, ni propriété foncière, ni vices, ni vertus; et cet état social est diablement idéal.'

Vieilli, débarrassé des influences étrangères, il se contentait d'affirmer sous la forme d'un 'beau paradoxe' ce que nous savons tous: que le vrai bonheur n'existe pas pour l'espèce humaine. Il aurait pu, cependant, ajouter ce qu'il avait écrit plusieurs années auparavant, dans sa *Réfutation de l'Ouvrage d'Helvétius*: 'Je suis convaincu que dans une société même aussi mal ordonnée que la nôtre, où le vice qui réussit est souvent applaudi et la vertu qui échoue presque toujours ridicule, je suis convaincu, dis-je, qu'à tout prendre, on n'a rien de mieux à faire pour son bonheur que d'être un homme de bien; c'est l'ouvrage, à mon gré, le plus important et le plus intéressant à faire, c'est celui que je me rappellerais avec le plus de satisfaction dans mes derniers moments.'

RENÉ P. LEGROS.

LONDON.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

BRENTANO'S 'LEGENDE DER HEILIGEN MARINA.'

In 1841 the havoc wrought by the sudden break-up of the ice on the Danube moved Brentano to publish his *Legende von der heiligen Marina*[1] for the benefit of the sufferers in the diocese of Regensburg, just as a similar disaster on the Mosel had led him to compose and sell his *Moseleisgangslied*[2] eleven years before. The original edition appears to be rare, as it is not mentioned by Goedeke. It is a slender volume of 32 numbered pages, measuring 16·5 × 10 cms. The title-page is as follows: 'Legende von der heiligen Marina, ein Gedicht von Clemens Brentano. Veranlaßt durch eine Zeichnung des Historienmalers Eduard Steinle aus Wien und auf Begehren abgedruckt zum Besten der durch den Donau-Eisgang 1841 Beschädigten in der Diöcese Regensburg. Preis 18 kr. München. Zu haben in der literarisch-artistischen Anstalt der Cotta'schen Buchhandlung, Promenadestraße.' 32v is blank. On the front of the green paper cover is an ornamental border containing the same inscription as that on the title-page and on the back is a similar border, enclosing a picture of a seated cherub playing on the pan-pipes.

The drawing by Eduard Steinle, which inspired Brentano to write his poem, shows the principal incidents in the life of the saint arranged to form a single picture. It is now preserved in the Basel Museum; a copy hangs in the National Gallery, Berlin, and a reproduction is to be found in Clemens Brentano's *Ausgewählte Schriften*, herausgegeben von J. B. Diel, Mit Illustrationen von E. Steinle, Freiburg im Breisgau, 1873, vol. I, facing page 84. It was made in the year 1838[3]. The drawing was in Brentano's hands and a portion of the poem had been written before November 20 of the same year, for on that day he writes to

[1] Clemens Brentano's *Gesammelte Schriften*, herausg. von Christian Brentano, Frankfurt a. M., 1852, I, p. 191. Accounts of the ravages made by the Danube in Regensburg may be found in the newspapers of the time, e.g.: in the *Königlich priviligirte Zeitung von Staats- und gelehrten Sachen* (subsequently the *Vossische Zeitung*), 1841, February 13: 'Regensburg den 3ten Februar: Was die von der jüngsten Ueberschwemmung bedrängten Dörfer betrifft, so haben sich die Fluthen bereits seit mehreren Tagen zurückgezogen, aber dafür nicht nur außen um die Gebäude sondern auch im Inneren derselben eine ungeheure Menge Eis zurückgelassen, so daß man sagen kann, alles liege dort im Eis erstarrt. Vor vielen Häusern mußte man, um zu ihnen gelangen zu können, erst gewaltig dicke Eismauern durchbrechen.' Further reports are to be found in the issues of February 10 and March 4.

[2] *Op. cit.*, p. 400.

[3] See Constant von Würzbach, *Ein Madonnenmaler unserer Zeit* (*Eduard Steinle*), Vienna, 1879.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Steinle as follows: 'Ihre Zeichnung der hl. Marina, welche ich Frl. Lindner zu ihrem Geburtstage nach Regensburg sendete, hat dieser so ungemein wohlgefallen, daß ich unter vielem andern begonnen habe, diese Legende in ein Gedicht zu bringen und zwar nicht ohne Beifall und Mühe. 150 Strophen ungefähr werden es werden; 120 etwa sind fertig...[1].' By the end of the year the poem was completed, for Brentano writes from Munich on January 3, 1839: 'Ich will Ihnen gelegentlich mein Lied von der Marina abschreiben lassen, d. h. den Theil, der Marina betrifft, das übrige[2] lese ich Ihnen einmal.' He does not appear to have been in any hurry to carry out his promise, for on April 2, 1839, Steinle acknowledges the receipt of a letter dated March 27 (not included in the *Briefwechsel*) and thanks Brentano for enclosing in it the poem 'welches meine Zeichnung wohl nicht allein überschreitet, sondern vielmehr überflügelt an Gehalt wie an Ausbildung.'

Brentano's *Marina* consists of three parts: The 'Zueignung an den Historienmaler Eduard Steinle aus Wien,' 'Die heilige Marina' and 'Conscientia.' The first is, of course, a purely personal note, the second is based on the legend of St Marina's martyrdom and the third is an addition, the source of which will be discussed below.

The name Marina occurs several times in mediaeval theology but the saint who is the subject of this legend is by far the best known. An account of the others will be found in *Acta Sanctorum Bollandiana*, Jul. Tom. IV, Die XXVII Julii, pp. 278–286, and L. Clugnet, *Vie et office de Sainte Marine, Bibliothèque hagiographique orientale*, vol. VIII (1905), pp. 7 f. Yet another Marina is the subject of a story used by Albrecht von Eyb, *Ob einem manne sey zu nemen ein eelich weib*, ed. Herrmann, *Schriften zur germ. Philol.*, Berlin, 1890, I, iv, pp. 59 f. An account of the influence subsequently exercised by the story is given by Herrmann, 'Die lateinische Marina,' *Vierteljahresschrift für Literaturgeschichte*, III, 1, p. 1. A Middle High German version of it was printed by Strauch, *Zeitschr. f. deut. Alt.*, XXIX, pp. 325 ff.

The legend of St Marina with which we are now dealing is undoubtedly of Eastern origin and the saint herself has always occupied a more important place in Eastern than in Western Christianity. To-day Venice is the only place in Western Europe where her worship still survives.

Many parts of Europe and the East have claimed to have been her home and the scene of her voluntary martyrdom. Clugnet, who in his

[1] Eduard Steinle's *Briefwechsel mit seinen Freunden*, Freiburg i. Br., 1897, I, p. 17.
[2] Presumably the 'Zueignung.'

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

work quoted above gives a comprehensive survey of all the contending claims and of the history of the worship of St Marina, together with a bibliography of the subject and the full texts of all the Greek, Latin, Syriac, Ethiopian, French and Middle High and Middle Low German 'Lives,' supports the view that she lived during the fifth century[1] at Kalamoun in S.E. Tripoli and suffered at the neighbouring monastery of Kanoubine. The tradition connecting St Marina with the latter can be traced back to the fifteenth century but her mortal remains are said to have been preserved in the Maronite church there until they were stolen during the thirteenth century. The traveller is still shown the grotto in which she is said to have passed her days of penance and the village of Torza, situated six hours' march from Kalamoun and two hours' march from Kanoubine, attributes the numerous earthquakes and other misfortunes which have befallen it to its having been the home of the innkeeper's daughter whose false accusations led to St Marina's martyrdom. St Marina is still the subject of peculiar veneration among the Maronites of Kanoubine.

The connection of St Marina with Venice dates from 1230, in which year, according to Andréas Dandolo's Chronicle[2], the body of the saint was acquired by the city 'pretio et precibus inductis custodibus' and placed in the Church of Saints Liberalis and Alexius, which was then reconsecrated to her. For further details, including the wrong date assigned by Petrus de Natalibus, *Catalogus sanctorum*, Lib. VI, Cap. 108, see Clugnet, *op. cit.*, p. 67. Where the relics came from is not clear, the Maronites of Kanoubine claiming them as theirs, whereas the Venetians profess that they were bought in Constantinople. When the Church of St Marina was demolished in 1818, the relics were transferred to the Church of St Maria Formosa.

There is evidence that St Marina was worshipped in Paris long before her remains were removed to Venice. A church bearing her name was used for public worship until 1792, when it was sold for use as a theatre. The building has since disappeared owing to the construction of the Rue d'Arcole.

The Maronites of Kanoubine and the Venetians celebrate the festival of St Marina on July 17. Other bodies have chosen different days (February 8 or 12 in the Greek Church, June 18 is assigned by the *Martyrologium Romanum*) owing to confusion with other saints.

There are two Latin *Vitae Sanctae Marinae*. The first, printed by

[1] The *Acta SS. Bolland.*, *l.c.*, p. 282, § iii, assign her to the first half of the eighth century.

[2] Muratori, *Rev. Ital. Script.*, III, Milan, 1728, col. 346.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Rossweyd, *Vitae Patrum*, Antwerp, 1615; Migne, *Patrol. Lat.*, vol. LXXIII, col. 691; in the *Acta Sanctorum Bollandiana*, Jul. Tom. IV, Die XXVII Julii, and by Clugnet, *op. cit.*, is the simpler and therefore probably the earlier version. A metrical adaptation without important alterations is given in the *Analecta Bollandiana*, XI (1892), pp. 246–9 and Clugnet, *op. cit.*, p. 269. This Life is probably derived from a Greek source and this is certainly true of the second and longer one found in Surius, *De Vitis Sanctorum*, Venice, 1851, re-edited by Lipomani, vol. I, under February 8 and reprinted by Clugnet, *op. cit.*, as Latin text M. This version is based on the Greek 'Life' written by Metaphrastes and differs materially from the former. Not only are a number of details added (Marina's father, whose name is not mentioned in the shorter Life, is called Eugenius; the monks thought Marina to be an eunuch because she had no beard; before her disgrace she wrought a miracle by healing a monk's injured hand; it was by the advice of her seducer that the innkeeper's daughter laid the blame on Marina; the monks threatened to leave the monastery unless Marina were pardoned; after Marina's death the girl confessed who was the father of her child), but alterations are made in the story itself (Marina's father announces his intention of becoming a monk and she, fearing to be left alone in a sinful world, offers to don male attire and follow him. Her name is given as Maria).

Brentano was not the first German poet to be attracted by the Legend of St Marina. Late fourteenth-century prose and verse versions exist both in Middle High and Middle Low German. All have been printed by Clugnet, *op. cit.*, pp. 125–147. The two Middle Low German texts have been edited by Schröder, *Vruwenlof und Vun sunte Marinen*, Erlangen, 1869, and the poem has been rendered into modern German verse by F. W. Genthe, *Deutsche Dichtungen im Mittelalter*, Eisleben, 1841–46. All go back to the shorter Latin 'Vita' although there is a discrepancy at the beginning of the prose texts, Marina's father remaining outside the monastery. This may be due to confusion with the Theodora legend.

The second part of Brentano's poem is based on the legend, but it is not clear what form or forms of it he knew. He was certainly not entirely dependent on the shorter Latin Life or on any account based on it, e.g., the *Legenda Aurea*, Petrus de Natalibus, *op. cit.*, or the Middle High and Middle Low German texts, for he mentions the name Eugenius which is unknown to these. He must therefore have had access to some Life influenced by Surius; nevertheless he includes none of the other details enumerated above as added by the latter. Hence we must conclude

Digitized by Google

Original from
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

either that he knew both accounts and, preferring the shorter one, took only the name Eugenius from the other, or that he made use of some edition of the shorter Life into which the name had already found its way. Brentano also knew that the sacred relics were preserved in Venice ('Als längst von hohem Steindom übermauert Der Leib Marina's in Venedig ruht'), a fact not stated in the Latin 'Vitae' but in the works of later writers such as Petrus de Natalibus. He must therefore have had some special information on the subject.

The Conclusion, headed 'Conscientia,' contains matter which is foreign to both Latin 'Vitae,' Petrus de Natalibus and the *Legenda Aurea*. I must confess my inability to point to any source for the madness and repentance of the seducer. Very possibly Brentano invented these details in order to round off the story and to render equal and poetic justice but it is quite conceivable that he knew of some form of a legend quoted by Clugnet from Baron de Reinsberg-Düringsfeld, *Traditions et légendes de la Belgique*, Brussels, 1870, vol. I, pp. 406–8, which tells of a recluse whose beauty roused the passions of a knight. As she steadfastly refused to gratify him, he procured her execution as a thief and a sorceress, but was punished by insanity, being healed some years later by a miracle at his victim's grave. A chapel was erected in memory of the 'Ellendige Marie' at Woluwe-Saint Lambert. It is significant that her festival is celebrated on June 18, the day assigned to St Marina in the *Martyrologium Romanum*, and that the name Marina frequently appears as Maria, e.g., in the *Legenda Aurea*.

Until we know what account of St Marina's life was in Brentano's hands we can not be certain how many of the poetic touches not found in the Latin 'Vitae' are his own work, but one example will suffice to show how the simple matter-of-fact story with a moral has been transformed into a charming piece of poetic imagery:

> Abbas dixit ei: 'Si diligis eum, uade et adduc eum huc et sit tecum.'—
> Der Abt sprach: 'Folge Sohn dem treuen Hirten,
> Führ her Dein Schäflein in den sichern Stall,
> Die Lämmer, die aus unserer Hut verirrten,
> Von uns einst fordert sie der Richter all.'
>
> Heim eilt der Vater, lößt die goldnen Locken
> Von seines Mägdleins Haupt; mönchisch verhüllt
> Den zarten Leib er, und des Klosters Glocken
> Begrüßen fromm getäuscht des Jünglings Bild.
>
> Und gleich der Primel, die gebeugt zur Erde
> Den Tau des Himmels trinkt am Felsenrand,
> Empfängt nun knie'nd mit kindlicher Gebärde
> Marina Segen von des Abtes Hand.

J. KNIGHT BOSTOCK.

HAMBURG.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES.

Further additions to the Supplement of the Bosworth-Toller 'Anglo-Saxon Dictionary.'

The following additions (see *M. L. R.* xvii, p. 165) are due mostly to sources not readily accessible while the Supplement was printing.

Ælfc. F. *Die Hirtenbriefe Ælfrics*, ed. Bernhard Fehr (*Bibliothek der A.-S. Prosa*, ix. Band).

Ll. At. *The Laws of the Earliest English Kings*, ed. F. L. Attenborough.

Wynfr. *Wynfrith's Letter*, ed. K. Sisam, *Mod. Lang. Rev.*, vol. xviii, pp. 253 sqq.

á-búgan ; (1a) *with dat.* :—Sceolon wé ábúgan þé *num adorabimus te* ?, Gen. 37, 10 : 9.
æfter :—Yfter hira dege, Txts. 445, 5 : 13.
ælednes (*in Dict.*) *Substitute* : æ-lætness :—Húses áwéstnes (ælédnes, *v. l.* ; *desertionem*), Lch. iii. 168, 16. v. á-lætnes.
æmettig :—Arrianus geendode swá æmtig on his innoþe, swá hé on his geleáfan wæs, Ælfc. F. 94, 13.
æt ; I 1a :—Æt openum græfe *before the grave is closed*, Ll. At. 6, 15.
á-fýsan. In By. 3 the word means *to drive, cause to hasten.*
ágan. Ib. of legal control or guardianship :—Gif ceorl ágan wile *if the husband will take charge of the children*, Ll. At. 14, 15. Þære cyrican hláford ðe ðone munuc áge, 68, 15.
án. XI a. marking resolution :—Mid ánum móde (ánrádnesse, *v. l.*), Ælfc. F. 82, 3. XII :—Hé ne mót habban twá mynstre ætgædere, for þan þe hé ne mæg gefyllan þone fullan þeówdóm on ægþrum stede on án tógædere, 142, 14.
án-ráed ; I 1 :—Hý ealle wæron ánræde him betweónan tó þære gesætnysse, Ll. Th. ii. 356, 6.
antef(e)n :—Antifon, Ælfc. F. 154, 11. Antifonas, antiphonas, 164, 9.
antefnere :—Se antifonere, antemnere, Ælfc. F. 154, 6.
an-wedd (and- ?). *Dele* (and- ?). Cf. *M. L. G.* an-wedden, v. Angl. xlvi. 212.
á-réceleásian *to neglect* :—Ealle þá þe...hé áréceleásode (*neglexit*) tó andettenne, Wynfr. 66.
á-sécan *to explore, try every part* :—Wæte of þám cláðe, and wringe on his calic. Dó swá lytlum and lytlum, oþ þ se cláð sý ásóht (*until every part has been so treated*), Ælfc. F. 172, 28.
á-wæscan :—Man þá weófodsceátas áwahxe (-wahse, -waxe, *v. ll.*), Ælfc. F. 156, 14.
á-wirpan :—Ic áwyrpe *conualeo*, Angl. xli. 109, 85.
â-wrítan *to carve* :—Lorh fægrę áwrittenne *colum sculptura variatam*, Wynfr. 169.
be-mánan (*with acc.*) :—Se déma his síð mid wópe bemánde, Hml. Th. i. 560, 24. Him man tó bær cild..., and his gingran þæt bemándon, 512, 25.
beód-læs. *Dele, and see* blód-láswa.
beón ; (2*b*) :—Gif se mon máran werude beó þonne twelfa sum, Ll. Th. i. 212, 8.
be-scildian *to shield, defend* :—Mé wæron þás mægnu bescyldigende (*defendentes*), Wynfr. 87. Bescylde[n]de *defensos*, 157.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

betera *having more*:—Þæt hé wǽre of úre ealra feó XII. pæng þe betera, Ll. Th. i. 234, 24.

be-wrigennes:—Wæs seó bewrigennys onweg ánumen *auferatur velamen*, Wynfr. 10 : 13.

blæstan. *Take here* blǽstan; III:—Se lég wæs forð blæstende (*flammam anhelantem*) ...þæt fýr wolde blæstan ofer ealne middangeard (*totius mundi machinam conplectentem*), Wynfr. 24–28. Fýrene seáðas wǽron úp blæstende (*eructantes flammam*), 91.

blód-láswa:—Tó hígna blódlése, Txts. 449, 67.

bóc-scild. *l.* bóh-scild. *See Thorpe's note.*

borh. I:—Þá mágas gangan him on borh *let the kinsmen go bail for him*, Ll. Th. i. 202, 16. On borh gehabban *to hold to bail*, 228, 28. On borh niman *to stand surety for*, 162, 19 : 204, 1. On borh settan *to make one give bail*, 208, 31. Tó borge settan *to take as security*, 160, 4.

box:—On clǽnum bocxse, Ælfc. F. 178, 31. v. húsel-box.

bran-wyrt (*in Dict.*) *Dele, see* Angl. xli. 127.

bring-ádl (?). v. hring-ádl.

broht? *Dr Bradley suggests the reading should be* broþ *iuscellum.*

bútan. I 2a marking exclusion, deprivation:—Beó se geréfa búton his folgoðe and búton mínum freóndscipe, Ll. Th. i. 240, 18. (3 a) *but not*:—Eallum freóum monnum þás dagas síen forgefene, bútan þeówum mannum, 92, 2.

bycgan *to sell* (?):—Deóre hé hit bohte *vel* sealde, *care vendidit*, undeóre hé bohte, *vile vendidit*, Wrt. Voc. i. 28, 62, 63.

ceác. *The vessel used in the ordeal by boiling water* (v. ceáp; III a), Ll. At. 48, 9.

cneów:—Licgende on cneówum *kneeling*, Ælfc. F. 154, 16.

cocer:—On coxre *in pharetra*, Ps. Cam. 10, 3.

collecta:—Cweþe se preóst þá collecta (-an, *v. l.*), Ælfc. F. 162, 8.

communia *the psalm sung while the Eucharist was taken*:—Gé ne scéolon singan... communian (-a, *v. l.*) (*communionem*), Ælfc. F. 168, 16.

crampiht *a kind of cake*:—Crompeht (Compheht, MS.) *folialis* ł *genus cibi*, Angl. xl. 352.

dígol-líce; (3) *in a low tone, not out loud*:—Cwæðe dígellíce: *Libera...*, and hlúde: *Per omnia...*, Ælfc. F. 28, 1 : 8 : 11.

disme:— þysma (*or* dysma) *casia*, Ps. L. Lind. 44, 9. *See* Angl. xliv. 94.

drúpung:—Ic eom drúpung and sleacnis (*torpor et desidia*), Wynfr. 59.

eaht; III:—Wexe be þæs ceápes æhte (eahte, *v. l.*), Ll. Th. i. 160, 2.

eall-hálgung *consecration*:—Geldlice ealhálgung *cerimonie*, g. *orgia*, Angl. xli. 106, 51.

earh-faru:—Gearwydon strá las hyra on coxre ł on earhfære *they prepared their shafts for shooting* (? the Latin has *pharetra*; for a suggested emendation earhwære *see* Angl. xl. 344), Ps. Cam. 10, 3.

éce *not perishable, durable*:—Calic geworht of écum antimbre, Ælfc. F. 126, 26.

eft-sóna:—Eftsóna *identidem*, Angl. xli. 99, 4.

fægere *gently, low*, of the voice:—Cweþe þonne fægre...eftsyþþan be sóne..., Ælfc. F. 166, 5.

feor-þeód *a distant people* or *country*:—Sió wæs eardigende in feorþióde *in longinqua regione habitabat*, Wynfr. 186.

féran *with complementary adj.* (*ptcpl.*):—Hí ne férdon gewǽpnode, Ælfc. F. 136, 13.

flind = flint *glossing* genetrix, applied to flint as the producer of fire. *See* Ald. 269, 7 and Angl. xlvi. 161.

for-bregdan; (3) Substitute: *to cover*:—On þére onlícnysse þe man þá eágan mid þicce hrægle forbrugde *veluti si oculi densissimo tegmine velentur*, Wynfr. 10. [v. *N.E.D.* forbraid.]

for-healdan; I a:—Man sceal healdan ꝑ húsl mid mycelre gýmene and ne forhealdan hit, Ll. Th. ii. 360, 11.

for-sellan:—Wá ðám ðe for sceattum forsylþ hyne silfne, Ælfc. F. 202, 7.

for-styntan:—Hé sǽde þæt him wurde...his eágena gesihð forstynted (*reverberatis oculorum pupillis*), Wynfr. 132. Forstynded, 32.

freólíce *as a festival*:—Wé healdað...ðone sunnandæg freólíce (freólsne, *v. l.*), Ælfc. F. 196, 12.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

geánoþ (?) *mourning*:—Geonges geánoðe geómres, An. Ox. XIV, last line. [*Goth.* gaunóþus.]
ge-dón; III. 1:—Se cásere him eallon gedón hét biglyfan genóhne, Ælfc. F. 92, 20.
ge-hálan *to castrate*:—Manega...hí sylfe geclænsiað fram fúlre gálnysse and beóð gástlíce geháledе, Ælfc. F. 106, 6.
ge-macian; IV. 3:—Seó módignyss gemacode tó deóflum þá englas, Ælfc. F. 204, 11.
ge-máhnes:—Ic eom gemánes (*contumacia*), Wynfr. 57.
ge-tácan; V. 2:—Wé ne scylan him deáð getácean, Ælfc. F. 140, 20.
ge-þyllan (?) *to quiet*:—Þæt sár geþylled weard (gestilled wæs, *v. l.*) *quiescente dolore*, Bd. Sch. 230, 16.
ge-yflian *with dat.*:—Hé nolde geyfelian þám árleásan menn, Ælfc. F. 138, 11.
gifu; *gen.* -u:—Gyfu týma *gratie tempus*, Ælfc. F. 76, 1.
gild-lic *festival*:—Geldlice ealhálgung *cerimonie*, ḡ. *orgia*, Angl. xli. 106, 51.
god-wrecnis:—Hé sylf gehýrdo ealle his godwyrcnisse and his ágene synna (*omnia flagitiorum propria peccamina*), Wynfr. 45.
hafocere:—Ná wé mótan huntian ne hafecaras beón, Ælfc. F. 140, 24.
heall-hálgung. *Dele, and see* gildlic.
heápian:—Hé heápode micel m[aniu synna on hine] *cumulatis sceleribus*, Wynfr. 76. Hig wáron heápiende heora synna pund on hió *peccatorum pondus gravando*, 43.
hláf *the sacramental bread*:—*Diaconus* mót hláf sillan and cild fullian, Ll. Th. ii. 378, 12.
hlít; III:—Gegripon þá deóflu þá sáwle, and hig sádon þæt hió wære hiora hlýtes (*sortis*), Wynfr. 137.
hlíwe. *Dr Bradley suggested that* hlípe *should be read.*
hrægel *as a masc., see* þurh-wæt.
hring-ádl. *Dr Bradley's suggestion for* bring-ádl.
hunta:—Nán hunta næs náfre hálig, Ælfc. F. 142, 2.
húsel-box *a box for keeping the housel in*:—Húselboxes, Ælfc. F. 178, 6.
[hwítling *a whiting*:—Hwítling *glaucus*, Nap. 14. 12th cent. MS.]
irmþ; II:—Gé habbað eówre yrmðe swá on gewunan gebróht, swylce hit nán pleoh ne sý ꝥ se preóst libbe swá swá ceorl, Ælfc. F. 4, 5.
lacen (?) *a cloak*:—Hacelau ł lachen (*but* cf.? *lacerna* haecile *vel* loða) ł loðan Wrt. Voc. ii. 21, 31. [*See N.E.D.* lake; *sb*^{5}.]
lamb:—Lambru and gehwylcu nýtenu, Ælfc. F. 114, 13.
lengan *to belong.* v. oþ-lengan.
leóf-fæst *dear, precious*:—ꝥ folc þe Críst álýsde mid his leóffæst (líffæstan, *v. l.*) blóde, Ælfc. F. 172, 13.
líf-fæst; II. *see preceding word, and take here the first three passages in the Dictionary.*
líhtian *to lighten, make less grave*:—Líhtigende hiora synna *peccatorum pondus relevando*, Wynfr. 44.
línen-weard:—Líneweard, Ælfc. F. 84, 19.
lorh *a distaff*:—Mægdenes lorh (*colum*)...mid fágum flése, Wynfr. 168.
mægþ-hád. *Dele and transfer the quotation to* mægþhád.
mengan:—Sume preóstas menegað wín tó fantwætere, Ælfc. F. 188, 7.
munuc *used of a woman*:—Gif hwá nunnan (cf. munuc, l. 15. *See second passage under* ágan) of mynstere út álæde, Ll. At. 68, 13. v. munuc-hád; II.
nacod; I d:—Gé sculan unscrýdan þá weófodu, and standan hí swá nacode (*denudata*), Ælfc. F. 156, 11.
níd-prin?:—Ðis is ꝥ neádprin þe preóst habban sceal (þás béc sceal mæssepreóst néde habban, *v. l.*), Ælfc. F. 13, 7.
níten:—Mýs oððe óþre nýtenu, Ælfc. F. 178, 18.
níw-bacen:—Twelf hláfas, ealle níbacene (-bace, *v. l.*), Ælfc. F. 180, 9.
notu; II a. *use* of a thing:—Hrægl þe tó note ær ne cóm *a cloth that has not yet come to be used*, Ælfc. F. 172, 16.
ofer-hebban:—Þá borgas synt ealle oferhafene (-hef-, *v. l.*), Ll. Th. i. 220, 15.
offerenda *the psalm sung during the offertory*:—Gé ne scylan singan offerendan (*offertorium*), Ælfc. F. 168, 15.
offrian; 1 (3):—Wápmen...þe...hí sylfe offriað Gode onsægdnysse, Ælfc. F. 106, 10.
on; B. I i:—Gif mon on fæmnan breóst gefó, Ll. Th. i. 68, 14.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

on-foran :—Tóđ onforan heáfde *a front tooth*, Ll. Th. i. 94, 10. Cf. foran ; II. 2 *aa*.
on-wǽre (?). *For the passage substitute* :—Genim on sláh þǽre seáw (cf. nim...centaurian...þǽre seáw, Lch. ii. 248, 19).
or-mætlic :—Áhófan þá deóflu swíđe ormætlicne hiáf (*fletum et ululatum magnum*), Wynfr. 148.
óþer ; I. 2 *the latter* :—Mæsseprcóst and bisceop habbađ ænne hád, þeáh se óđer (*the bishop*) sý furđor, Ælfc. F. 11, 12.
oþ-lengan *to belong, pertain* :—Hé nyste þæt hit tó synna ođlengde *ad peccatum pertinere nesciebat*, Wynfr. 49. Ođlengdon, 68.
pic-bred (?) *l.* (?) picg-breád *mast, pig-food.* v. *N.E.D.* s. v. pig. *Dele bracket in Dict.*
pól-bǽr, e ; *f. Pasture land by a pool* :—On monnes pólbǽre, C. D. iii. 415, 5.
pund *weight* :—Heápiende hiora synna pund *peccatorum pondus gravando*, Wynfr. 43.
ræde *reading.* v. béc-ræde.
recen ; I :—Seó tunge...þe ær hæfde ful recene spræce, Nap. 74, 18.
rúma :—Rúma *offendiculum*, i. *scandalum*, Angl. xli. 102, 20.
ryge :—Rige *siligo*, i. e. *genus frumenti*, Angl. xli. 102, 22.
saftriende. Substitute : *rheumy* :—Saftriende *vel* drefliende *rheumaticus*.
sceþþigness *hurt, harm, injury* :—Gesund gehealden fram þára léga sceađđignesse (*a lesione flammarum*), Wynfr. 35.
sellan ; III *aa to hand over* for a purpose (*infin.*) :—Sylle hé eallum cyssan bóc, Ll. Th. i. 226, 24. IV. *as opposed to* gifan :—Þ nán man ne sylle nán hors ofer sá bútan hé gifan wile, Ll. Th. i. 208, 18.
slápfulness. *Dele.* v. Angl. xli. 146, 272.
slápol :—Ungemetlíce slápol *lethargus* ✝ *letargicus*, Ælfc. Gr. Z. 305, 7.
sprecan ; III d. *with cognate accusative* :—Spræce sprecan *to make a claim at law*, Ll. Th. i. 238, 11.
stálian *to make an accusation* :—Gif Englisc onstál gá forđ (Englisc mon stálađ, *v. l.*), Ll. Th. i. 130, 15.
stræcness ; II :—Þá strecan mód mid hyra strecnysse hit gegrípađ, Ælfc. F. 80, 10.
streát, es. *Dele, read* strǽt : streát ; *adj. Dele* ; *the MS. has* greát : sulh ; Coll. M. 30, 29, *dele, and see* sýla.
sweþrian :—Se lég swiđrode *flamma decrescente resedit*, Wynfr. 30.
swician ; I a. figurative :—Ic eom swiciende geþóht *ego sum vaga cogitatio*, Wynfr. 60.
swíge-niht = swíg-dæg ; *q. v.* :—In cena domini et in parasceue et in sancto sabbato—on þyssum þrým swígenihtum..., Ælfc. F. 154, 3.
sýla :—Hwanon sýlan scear oþþe culter *unde aratori uomer aut culter*, Coll. M. 30, 29.
tintrega :—In þá tintregan eá *in Tartareum flumen*, Wynfr. 118.
tyrdlu :—Mid músa tyrdlum befíled, Ælfc. F. 128, 5.
þǽr-onefen *alongside* :—Sette hé þone calic þǽronemn, Ælfc. F. 164, 18.
þe, *after* þára *with verb* (1) *singular* :—Gehwilcne man þára þe wilnaþ, Bt. F. 170, 16. Ælces đára đe wel doo, Past. 75, 12 : B. 1461 : 2251. (2) *plural* :—Cynna gehwylcum þára đe cwice hwyrfaþ, B. 98 : 784.
þeóf-mann :—Þeáh þe hé...beó...mycel þeófman, Ælfc. F. 140, 19.
þrang. *Dele, and see* wudu-byrđra.
þridda ; II :—Nime hió hire đriddan sceat, Ll. Th. i. 138, 19.
þriddan-dǽl *a third* :—Stande þriddandǽl þǽre bóte inne, Ll. Th. i. 94, 6 : 4 : 98, 17. Cf. feórþan-dǽl.
þurh-wǽt *thoroughly wet, soaked* :—Hé nime lýnen hrægl...and bedyppe on wíne ✝ hé þurhwǽt sý, Ælfc. F. 172, 18.
un-æþelboren *plebeian* ; ignobilis, i. plebeius, Angl. xli. 108, 66.
un-cyst ; III a :—Þú for uncyste cleric habban nelle, Ælfc. F. 176, 28 : 198, 22.
un-forrtiendig, *v. l. to* unforrotigendlic (*q. v.*), Ælfc. F. 14, 6.
un-gearu ; I :—Ungearo tó álcum góde, Ælfc. F. 210, 1.
un-rádfæst *ill-advised, foolish, unwise* :—Hé byđ þurh gylp unrádfæst on dádum, Ælfc. F. 212, 15.
un-scrýdan *to uncover* a thing :—Gé sculon unscrýdan þá weófodu, Ælfc. F. 156, 10.
un-wyrd. *In the first passage the word translates* infirmitas, Archiv 134, 275.
wát, v. þurh-wǽt : wæscan. *Add* : wahsan. v. á-wæscan.
wannian :—Þæt húsel wannađ...on swá langum fyrste, Ælfc. F. 178, 11.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

warenian ; I 2:—Warnige se láreów wiđ ϸ þe se wítega cwæđ, Ælfc. F. 15, 4.
weorold-cræfta, -cræftica *a secular artificer*:—Hwí scyle gé wáccran beón þonne woruldcræftan (weorldcræftican *v. l.*) on eówrum gástlicum þeówdóme, Ælfc. F. 128, 10.
weorold-cræftig *skilled in secular arts*:—Ealle woruldcræftige men wyrcađ hira tól, Ælfc. F. 128, 25.
wíce *function*:—Sé đe stilđ, hé hæfđ wulfes wícan, Ælfc. F. 200, 16.
wíf-scrúd:—Ná mót wer beón mid wífscrúde gescrýd, Ælfc. F. 142, 7.
wífung; II. *Take the passage to* I., *and* cf. mid; VII a.
wudu-byrþra. *See* Angl. xl. 343 : xliii, 98.
wyrcan *to employ* an implement:—Ealle woruldcræftige men wyrcađ hira tól, Ælfc. F. 128, 26.

T. N. Toller.

Manchester.

Notes on 'Sir Gawain and the Green Knight[1].'

I. 'Sturtes.' After the poet, in his elaborate description of the Green Knight's equipment, has stated that the pendants of his horse's poitrel, the crupper, the bit, and all the metal were enamelled (of green), he adds (lines 170–2):

> Þe steropes þat he stod on, stayned of þe same,
> & his arsoun3 al after, & his a þel sturtes,
> Þat euer glemered & glent al of grene stones.

Madden and Morris defined *sturtes* 'stirrups,' and the translators follow[2], or omit the word altogether[3], or use a mere stop-gap[4]. *Sturtes* obviously does not mean 'stirrups,' since quite apart from the impossible form, the 'steropes' have just been mentioned in the line immediately preceding. *Sturt* (plural *sturtes*) is simply the regular West Midland form of O.E. *steort*, 'tail, promontory,' M.E. *stert*, Mod. Engl. *start*, meaning here a projecting metal knob or ornamental nail; compare *O.E.D.* s.v. *start*, sb[1]. 4, 'an outgrowth, a projecting point or spur,' and especially the *English Dialect Dictionary*, s.v. *start*, sb[2]. 2, 'an extremity, point; a projection; a nail; a tang; the ring of a button, &c.' It is well known that O.E. *eo* regularly became *u* in the West Midland, particularly in proximity to a nasal or liquid[5]. Thus O.E. *steort*, in the poet's dialect, would regularly become *sturt*, as *beorn* became *burn(e)* (*Gawain* 20, 73,

[1] These notes are discussions of difficulties which could not be adequately treated in brief space in my forthcoming edition of the poem.
[2] Jessie L. Weston, *Sir Gawain*, etc. (prose translation), New York, 1905, p. 6.
[3] J. B. Kirtlan, *Sir Gawain*, etc., London, 1912, p. 62.
[4] Jessie L. Weston translates 'girths' in *Romance, Vision and Satire* (verse translation), London, 1912, p. 10; K. G. T. Webster, who recognizes the difficulty 'reins,' *Sir Gawain*, etc., Boston, 1917, p. 4.
[5] K. Luick, *Historische Grammatik der englischen Sprache*, § 357, p. 333; H. C. Wyld, *Englische Studien*, xlvii, 49; cf. Wyld, *Short History of English*, § 169, pp. 109–10.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

337, 776, etc.) and *reord* became *rurd(e)* (*Gawain* 1149, 1698, 1916, 2219, etc.)[1].

This explanation receives clear confirmation from the occurrence of the word 'nails' in the later description of Gringolet's equipment, at the place which exactly corresponds to that of *sturtes* in the description of the Green Knight's horse:

> Þe cropore, and þe couertor, acorded wyth þe arsounez ;
> & al watz rayled on red ryche golde nayleȝ,
> Þat al glytered & glent as glem of þe sunne. Lines 602–4.

In the illustration which faces the opening of the poem in MS. Cotton Nero A x, there are such studded 'nails' at the intersection of the straps on the Green Knight's horse[2].

II. 'Ver.' After 'ryche robes' have been brought forth for Gawain to choose from, the poet says (lines 864–70):

> Sone as he on hent, & happed þer-inne,
> Þat sete on hym semly, wyth saylande skyrteȝ,
> Þe ver by his uisage verayly hit semed
> Wel neȝ to vche haþel alle on hwes,
> Lowande & lufly, alle his lymmeȝ vnder,
> Þat a comloker knyȝt neuer Kryst made, hem þoȝt.

The usual explanation is that of Madden and Morris, who glossed *ver* 'man' (Morris deriving from O.N. *ver*), and are followed by the translators. There are two objections to this interpretation. (1) O.N. *ver* as well as O.E. *wer* would give M.E. *wer*, not *ver*. In spite of the fact that initial *w* is sometimes represented by *v* in the alliterative poems of the manuscript[3], the alliteration in such cases (for example *Pearl* 772: 'wolde wedde unto his vyf') shows that this is merely orthographical. Of the actual alliteration of *w*-words (spelled with either *w* or *v*) there is no certain example in the whole manuscript[4]. (2) The syntax is as hard to explain as the phonology, since one would expect 'he semed' rather than 'hit semed'; and one has either to supply 'that he was,' or assume an anacoluthon of some sort.

Because of the first difficulty, O. F. Emerson proposed another explanation[5]: that *ver* was the M.E. *ver*, 'spring' (from O.F. *ver*) used by Chaucer and Gower. He translated lines 865–70:

[1] For further examples see *Publ. Mod. Lang. Assoc.*, xxxvii, 512. Since writing this note, I find that Miss Serjeantson's collectanea (*English Studies*, iv, 197) contain many examples of the form *sturte* (O.E. *steort*) in place-names from south-western documents.

[2] Compare further the pictures of the Knight, the Prioress, the Monk, the Nun's Priest, the Squire, and the Wife of Bath, in the Ellesmere MS. (reproduced in the Chaucer Society *Six-Text Print of the Prologue and Knight's Tale*); Viollet-le-Duc, *Dict. du Mobilier Français*, s.v. *harnois*, vi, pp. 39, 59, 60, plates 11, 26, 27; and such pictures as Uccello's Battle of Sant'Egidio (1416) in the National Gallery.

[3] Fr. Knigge, *Die Sprache des Dichters von Sir Gawain*, Marburg, 1885, p. 55.

[4] K. Schumacher, *Studien über den Stabreim*, *Bonner Beiträge*, xi, p. 71.

[5] *Modern Language Notes*, xxxvi, 213–15.

Digitized by Google Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

> The spring (ver), compared with his appearance (visage), verily seemed
> Well nigh to each hero all one in hue;
> Glowing (lowande) in looks and lovely in all his limbs,
> A comelier knight Christ never made, they thought.

The reference, according to Emerson, would be to the Host's favourite colour, green. But such fantastic subtlety seems hardly characteristic of the poet.

It is much simpler, I think, to interpret *ver* as a mere variant in spelling of M.E. *vair* (O.F. *vair*, *veir*, *ver*), 'spotted or variously coloured fur, used for lining or trimming' (see *O.E.D.*), and putting a comma after *uisage*, to consider the phrase 'þe ver by his uisage,' as an additional descriptive detail similar to 'wyth saylande skyrteȝ.' The passage may then be translated: 'As soon as he took one and wrapped himself in it, which fitted him fairly, with flowing skirts, the fur-trimming (i.e. a collar of fur) by his face, truly it (the robe) seemed well nigh to every man there wholly of glowing and lovely colours[1], beneath all his limbs,' etc. There can be no objection to the form, for O.F. *ai* before *r* sometimes appears as *e* in the Gawain-poet[2], as in Middle English generally[3]; cf. M.E. *menuver*, *menyver*, *O.E.D.* s.v. *miniver*. For 'vair' trimming of robes, compare Chrétien's *Yvain* (1885):

> Et avuec ce li aparoille
> Robe escarlate vermoille
> De ver forree atot la croice.

III. Perhaps the most difficult passage in the poem is the last three lines of one of Gawain's replies to the lady at her first unceremonious visit (1264–7)[4]:

> For I haf founden, in god fayth, yowre fraunchis nobele;
> & oþer ful much of oþer folk fongen hor dedeȝ,
> Bot þe daynté þat þay delen for my disert nysen;
> Hit is þe worchyp of your-self, þat noȝt bot wel connez.

It will be necessary to quote three attempts to interpret this passage[5]:

(1) Webster (in his translation): 'People judge a person's deeds

[1] It is not necessary, as Emerson thinks, to interpret 'on hwes' as 'one in colour,' since *alle* provides sufficient vocalic alliteration for the second half-line, so that *on* may be the unemphatic 'in.' But this, in any case, would not affect the meaning of *ver*, 'fur,' as it would be possible to translate 'the robe seemed...wholly of one colour, all his limbs glowing beneath (it).'

[2] Knigge, *op. cit.*, p. 103.

[3] Behrens, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der franz. Sprache in England*, p. 128.

[4] I quote, as usual, from Gollancz's revised edition (1912). Morris's punctuation was slightly different—comma after *nobele*, semi-colon after *dedeȝ*, comma after *nysen*.

[5] I omit the translations of Miss Weston (prose and verse), Kirtlan, and P. G. Thomas (*Englische Studien*, XLVII, 253), as too wide of the mark.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

largely from the accounts of others [Webster's note: 'the last clause is obscure in the text']; but the praise that they accord my deserts is but idle. It is simply your own nobility, who know nothing but good.'

(2) Kenneth Hare[1] (in note, p. 84, 'founded upon the late Professor Napier's rendering'): '...and other men receive fame for their deeds, full much, from other people, but as to the great matter they make of my deserts they are foolish; it is your noble nature that knoweth naught but good.' (But 'as to' and the second 'they' of this sentence are supplied.)

(3) Emerson[2]: '"And others full commonly of other people take their actions (follow what other people do or think), but the nice things they say in regard to my deserts are of no value, it is the estimation of yourself who knows naught but good," with the implication "that I prize."'

Apart from other objections to these translations, they are all, I think, vitiated by adopting Morris's gloss of *nysen* as a verb in the present plural meaning 'be foolish.' Why should a verb which exists neither in Old French nor in Middle English be invented for a position in which it cannot possibly be construed? If it is the predicate of *daynté* (Webster, Emerson), it should be singular (or *daynté* plural); if it is the predicate of *þay* (Napier-Hare), another *þay* has to be inserted in the text, for the syntax of 'the great matter they make of my deserts, are foolish' is surely impossible even for the author of *Gawain*. We must therefore either resort to emendation[3], or better, explain *nysen* as an entirely different word. Now it is well known that the *n*'s and *u*'s of our manuscript, like those of many other manuscripts, are indistinguishable[4], so that the word in question may be indifferently read as *nysen* or *uysen*; *uysen* would, of course, stand for *vysen*, initial *v* being not infrequently represented by *u* in the manuscript[5]. M.E. *vyse*, 'to devise, contrive, make' (*O.E.D.* s.v. *vise*), occurs several times in the *Wars of Alexander* (4686, 5651), and *avyse* is used in the same sense by the poet of *Gawain* in line 45. With a comma after *delen*, the line 'Bot þe daynté þat þay delen, for my disert uysen—' means 'but the honour

[1] *Sir Gawayne*, etc., Stratford-upon-Avon, 1918.

[2] *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, XXI, 384.

[3] A simpler emendation than any of those implied in the above translations would be to *nyse*, adjective, making Gawain refer in a deprecating manner to his 'foolish worth,' but the adjective hardly seems the right one.

[4] For example, *derue*, 588 (Morris, Gollancz), was printed *derne* by Madden; *meue*, 985, 1157, 1197 (Gollancz), was printed *mene* by Madden and Morris; *ryneȝ*, 2290 (Gollancz), was printed *ryueȝ* by Madden and Morris. The first letter of *uysen* looks exactly as much like *u* in the manuscript as the first letter of *uerayly*, 161.

[5] For example, 161 *uerayly*, 575 *uiage*, 866 *uisage* (quoted above).

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

that they bestow, devise for my desert,' the second half of the line being a kind of elaboration and elucidation of the first[1].

The whole passage, it should be remembered, is Gawain's evasive reply to the lady's complimentary remark that his 'prys and prowes plese3 al o*þ*er' (1249), and that there are plenty of ladies who would rather have him in their possession than all their wealth. It may be translated literally thus: 'And others receive their deeds (i.e. derive their reputation for noble actions) from other people, but the honour that they bestow, devise for my desert—that is your own nobility, that knows only good.' Cryptic as this may seem, with the proper emphasis the meaning is clear enough. The contrast, I think, is not only between the first *o*þ*er* and *my disert*, but also between the second *o*þ*er* (and *þay*) and *þe worchyp of yourself*. Gawain means (to paraphrase very freely): 'And it is true that other men (than he) derive their reputation for noble deeds from other people, but, in this case, the honour and esteem that people bestow upon him (about which the lady has just discoursed)—that is not so much his real reputation among other people, as the lady's own generous idea of him, since she cannot be other than polite.'

ROBERT J. MENNER.

NEW HAVEN, CONN., U.S.A.

SPENSER'S KNOWLEDGE OF PLATO.

> Cicuta bad,
> With which th' unjust Atheniens made to dy
> Wise Socrates, who, thereof quaffing glad,
> Poured out his life and last Philosophy
> To the faire Critias, his dearest Belamy.
>
> Spenser, *F. Q.* II, 7, 54.

> Witnesse the father of Philosophie,
> Which to his Critias, shaded oft from sunne,
> Of love full manie lessons did apply.
>
> *F. Q.* IV, *Introductory Stanzas* 3.

The two passages contain a curiously complicated set of blunders which it is worth while to unravel. To begin with the second. The 'father of Philosophie' is Socrates, who is twice over called *parens philosophiae* by Cicero, *de Finibus* II, i, 1, Socrates, qui parens philosophiae iure dici potest, *de Nat. deor.* I, xxxiv, 93, Socratem ipsum, parentem philosophiae. 'Shaded oft from sunne' is an allusion to the famous passage about the plane-tree under which Socrates and Phaedrus

[1] *Nysen* could not, of course, be interpreted, even with such a change in the punctuation.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

held their conversation, Plato, *Phaedrus* 230 b, *ἥ τε γὰρ πλάτανος αὕτη μάλ' ἀμφιλαφής τε καὶ ὑψηλή,...καὶ τὸ σύσκιον πάγκαλον.* It was, however, not with Critias but with Phaedrus that Socrates held the conversation under the plane. How comes Spenser to make the mistake? Probably he confuses the *Phaedrus* with the other great 'erotic' discourse, the *Symposium*. But Critias is no more present in the *Symposium* than in the *Phaedrus*. It is, however, notorious that Alcibiades plays a very prominent part in the *Symposium* and we learn from the dialogue that Alcibiades 'posed' as the 'Belamy' of Socrates. Alcibiades and Critias are frequently coupled together, by writers from Xenophon onwards, as politicians who had been associates of Socrates and had damaged him in the eyes of his countrymen by their misdeeds. Spenser may well have been thinking of the conjunction of the names in Cicero *De Oratore* III, xxxiv, 139, quid Critias, quid Alcibiades? civitatibus suis quidem non boni, sed certe docti atque eloquentes, nonne Socraticis erant disputationibus eruditi? A confusion of Critias with Alcibiades and a further confusion of the *Phaedrus* with the *Symposium* will then explain the statement that Socrates used to discourse 'in the shade' with Critias about love.

The other passage is still more curious. To begin with, there is obviously the confusion, common in the Middle Ages, of the *Phaedrus* with the *Phaedo*. The 'last philosophy' which Socrates poured out with his life manifestly means the discourse on the hope of immortality held in the prison, and the poet is no doubt reproducing Socrates' own description of it as his 'swan-song' (Plato, *Phaedo* 85 a, b). The mention of the 'Belamy' shows that we have further to reckon with the confusion of Critias with Alcibiades. But there remains a still more curious confusion. Alcibiades was not present at the death of Socrates, nor was Critias. Both had come to dishonoured ends some years earlier. Yet Spenser's language seems to mean that the 'dearest Belamy' *was* present at the death of Socrates and that Socrates 'poured out his life' to him[1]. In fact, he has confused Socrates with another famous man who ended by a draught of 'cicuta bad' and actually owed his death to Critias,—Theramenes, son of Hagnon, the leader of the more moderate party among the 'Thirty' of the year of anarchy 404–3 B.C. Xenophon (*Hellenica* II, iii, 56) relates that there was a current story that when Theramenes was forced to drink the hemlock, he tossed out the last drops, like a player at the *cottabus* game, with the words 'to my pretty Critias'

[1] Or is it merely meant that Socrates 'poured out his life and last Philosophy' in *honour* of Critias? Even so, the statement would be untrue.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

(Κριτίᾳ τοῦτ' ἔστω τῷ καλῷ). The act and the words are those of a man 'toasting' his 'Belamy,' and the story thus explains Spenser's 'quaffing glad,' 'poured out his life' and 'dearest Belamy,' only that he has apparently mistaken the irony of Theramenes for earnest.

This confusion of Theramenes with Socrates might seem incredible but for one small point of resemblance in the two death-scenes. Theramenes 'tossed out' the drops of the fatal draught as a 'toast' to Critias. Socrates also, according to Plato, proposed to pour out a few drops, but for a different purpose, πρὸς τὸ ἀποσπεῖσαί τινι, as a 'grace' before drinking[1], and only abstained from doing so when he was warned that the dose of hemlock was barely sufficient (*Phaedo* 117 b). Yet, I think, Spenser's confusion may be explained apart from this particular point of resemblance. The truth is, Spenser was taking his information at second-hand from the first book of Cicero's *Tusculans*. In that work (XL–XLI, 96–99), courage in the face of imminent death is illustrated by two examples, that of Theramenes and that of Socrates. The courage of Theramenes is proved by the anecdote out of Xenophon, that of Socrates by quoting, from the *Apology* of Plato, his final speech after condemnation.

Thus it seems to result from comparison of the two passages of the *F. Q.* that Spenser's knowledge about Socrates does not go beyond a confused recollection of certain works of Cicero which were far better known to educated men in general in the sixteenth century than they are in the twentieth. If Spenser had ever read Plato for himself there is nothing in these passages to prove it, and the blunder about the incidents of Socrates' last day could not well have been made by any one who knew the *Phaedo*. Yet if Spenser was unacquainted with the *Phaedo*, is it likely that he knew any Platonic work at first-hand? Here is a question that deserves investigation[2]—Was the 'poets' poet,' after all, a bit of a humbug?

A. E. TAYLOR.

ST ANDREWS.

[1] Prof. Bennet even suggests in the note on this passage in his edition of the *Phaedo* that Socrates was thinking of the act of Theramenes and proposed to 'toast' Anytus in the same fashion. But ἀποσπένδειν surely means definitely to 'pour out some as a σπονδή,' and this can only be done in honour of a 'god' or 'hero.'

[2] The reference to the plane-tree of the *Phaedrus* and that, if it is intended, to the swans of the *Phaedo* require no direct knowledge of Plato. For the plane-tree see the careful imitation of the Platonic passage in Cicero *de Oratore* I, vii, 28. The swans of the *Phaedo* are reproduced in the *First Tusculan* XXX, 73. It seems to me that the *de Oratore* and *First Tusculan* are the source of everything Spenser supposes himself to know about Socrates. It does not even follow that he had read Cicero's treatises for himself.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

A Manuscript Poem of Wordsworth.

On a dirty, torn quarto sheet of paper in *Bundle* 1 *Miscellaneous* among Crabb Robinson's papers preserved at Dr Williams's Library, Gordon Square, London, I recently discovered a poem in Wordsworth's handwriting, which proved, on investigation, to be a first draft of his lines *To the Moon. Composed by the seaside—on the coast of Cumberland, 1835*, sometimes included, e.g. in W. M. Rossetti's edition, among the *Evening Voluntaries*, as the last but one of the series.

The MS., as is usual when it is an autograph of the poet, is very difficult to read and at times almost illegible; it has no date, title or signature and, a somewhat unusual circumstance with Crabb Robinson's papers, it is neither endorsed nor dated by him. Wordsworth has scratched out and altered a good many words, lines and passages on this scribbled page, and comparison with the published version shows that there were many subsequent changes before he passed the poem for press in the 1837 volume. The reference, twice repeated, to the moon as 'the Sailor's Friend' and other identical or almost identical lines and phrases marked below, make it pretty certain that this is the original version of the poem. It is shorter than and otherwise inferior to the accepted text—itself not among the great poems of Wordsworth—but it is interesting as illustrating the development and correction of his work before it was considered suitable for publication. Evidently his emendations were not always for the worse but he was able at times to exercise with advantage his critical faculty on his own work.

Another point worth notice is that some of the deleted lines in the original version were utilised in the second ode *To the Moon*, the last of the *Evening Voluntaries*, e.g. in ll. 1—5:

> Queen of the stars!—so gentle, so benign,
> That ancient Fable did to thee assign,
> When darkness creeping o'er thy silver brow
> Warned thee these upper regions to forego,
> Alternate empire in the shades below—

which may be compared with ll. 10—14 (erased) of the subjoined poem. This is a facsimile, as accurate as I can make it, of the MS. page, including the deletions. Words and letters in square brackets are my own insertions.

> [1] What fond affections on the name attend
> Which calls thee, gentle Moon! *the Sailor's Friend!*
> So calls thee not alone for what the sky
> Through mist or cloud permits thee to supply

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

(As from a moving watch tower) of wan light
To guide his Bark through perils of the night :
But for thy private bounties ; for that meek
And tender influence of which few will speak
Though it can wet with tears the hardiest cheek.
  Say is there one
~~Queen of the~~ Stars, as bright as when of yore
~~Whole nations~~ knelt thy presence to adore
~~Thou to~~ whom Fable gave (Truth loved the [*sic*] so)
~~When thou doon~~ [wert ?] doomed those regions to forego
~~Alternate~~ empire in the shades below
  Say is there one
Breathes ~~there~~ a Man of all whose business lies
  deep cut off
On the great ~~waters~~ far from household ties,
A Man endowed with human sympathies,
Who has not felt the fitness of thy sway
To cherish thoughts that shun the blaze of day,
  soft
The ~~true~~ accordance of thy placid chear
With all that pensive memory holds most dear
Or Fancy pictures forth to soothe a breast
~~That asks not happiness but longs for~~ [*MS. torn.* ? rest]
Tired with its daily share of ear[th's unrest. *MS. torn : cf. published version*] [*end of page*]
  the Helmsman alone on and he sees
And [*MS. torn*] the lifelong Wanderer o'er the seas
Steers his [*MS. torn*] ship before a steady breeze
[Runs ? *illegible*] ~~a smooth course~~ [?] before a steady breeze
While he keeps watch in some far distant clime
Dull darkness
~~Thy absence~~ adding to the weight of time
Oft does thy image with his memorys [*sic*] blend
And thou art Still, O Moon, the ~~Poet~~ Sailors Friend.
  has marked watched
Who ~~while he marks~~ thee bright as when of yore
Whole nations knelt thy presence to adore
  crossed
Beholds the[e] girt by clouds that slowly move
Catching the lustre they in part reprove
Nor felt the fitness of thy modest sway
To cherish the thought that shuns the blaze of day.

For convenience in comparison, I reprint also the published version of the poem, which is prolix but in many respects more satisfactory :

Wanderer ! that stoop'st so low, and com'st so near
To human life's unsettled atmosphere ;
Who lov'st with Night and Silence to partake,
So might it seem, the cares of them that wake :
And, through the cottage-lattice softly peeping,
Dost shield from harm the humblest of the sleeping :
What pleasure once encompassed those sweet names
Which yet in thy behalf the Poet claims,
An idolising dreamer as of yore !—

[1] The lines deleting ll. 10—14 are vertical in the MS. and obliterate only the first word or two in each line, *doon* in l. 13 being separately erased. It is not possible to be sure to how much of the lines the deletion was intended to apply. But cf. the passage from the second *Ode to the Moon* quoted ante, p. 211.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

I slight them all; and, on this sea-beat shore
Sole-sitting, only can to thoughts attend
[1]That bid me hail thee as the SAILOR'S FRIEND:
So call thee for heaven's grace through thee made known
By confidence supplied and mercy shown,
When not a twinkling star or beacon's light
Abates the perils of a stormy night;
And for less obvious benefits, that find[1]
Their way, with thy pure help, to heart and mind;
Both for the adventurer starting in life's prime:
And veteran ranging round from clime to clime,
Long-baffled hope's slow fever in his veins,
And wounds and weakness oft his labour's sole remains.

The aspiring Mountains and the winding Streams,
Empress of Night! are gladdened by thy beams;
A look of thine the wilderness pervades,
And penetrates the forest's inmost shades;
Thou, chequering peaceably the minster's gloom,
Guid'st the pale Mourner to the lost one's tomb;
Canst reach the Prisoner—to his grated cell
Welcome, though silent and intangible!
And lives there one, of all that come and go
On the great waters toiling to and fro,
One, who has watched thee at some quiet hour
Enthroned aloft in undisputed power,
[2]Or crossed by vapoury streaks and clouds that move
Catching the lustre they in part reprove—[2]
[3]Nor sometimes felt a fitness in thy sway
To call up thoughts that shun the glare of day[3],
And make the serious happier than the gay?

Yes, lovely Moon! if thou so mildly bright
Dost rouse, yet sorely in thy own despite
To fiercer mood the phrenzy-stricken brain,
Let me a compensating faith maintain;
That there's a sensitive, a tender part
Which thou canst touch in every human heart,
For healing and composure.—But as least
And mightiest billows ever have confessed
Thy domination; as the whole vast Sea
Feels through her lowest depths thy sovereignty;
So shines that countenance with especial grace
On them who urge the keel her *plains* to trace
Furrowing its way right onward. The most rude,
Cut off from home and country, may have stood—
Even till long gazing hath bedimmed his eye,
Or the mute rapture ended in a sigh—
[4]Touched by accordance of thy placid cheer,
With some internal lights to memory dear,
Or fancies stealing forth to soothe the breast
Tired with its daily share of earth's unrest,[4]
Gentle awakenings, visitations meek;
[5]A kindly influence whereof few will speak,
Though it can wet with tears the hardiest cheek.[5]

And when thy beauty in the shadowy cave
Is hidden, buried in its monthly grave;

[1] Cf. MS., l. 2 to l. 7. [2] Cf. MS., ll. 32, 33. [3] Cf. MS., ll. 18, 19 and ll. 34, 35.
[4] Cf. MS., ll. 20—23. [5] Cf. MS., ll. 8, 9.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

[1] Then, while the Sailor 'mid an open sea
Swept by a favouring wind that leaves thought free
Paces the deck—no star perhaps in sight,
And nothing save the moving ship's own light
To cheer the long dark hours of vacant night[1]—
[2] Oft with his musings does thy image blend,
In his mind's eye thy crescent horns ascend,
[3] And thou art still, O Moon, that SAILOR'S FRIEND!

The question naturally arises how Crabb Robinson came to possess Wordsworth's MS. and no answer can be discovered in the extant correspondence or papers. But we know that Robinson was frequently sent or shown new poems long before their publication and that he not seldom ventured to suggest changes, either directly to the poet or in letters to Mrs Wordsworth or Dorothy. Sometimes these alterations were accepted, sometimes reasons were given for disapproval of them; there is no reason to suppose that Wordsworth ever resented his friend's criticisms. It may well be that this MS. was sent to Crabb Robinson in the ordinary course of correspondence, or, since he does not acknowledge or comment upon it, perhaps he got hold of it during one of his visits to Rydal Mount, or when he was travelling with Wordsworth in 1837. Be this as it may, we can be grateful to him for its preservation, along with much else that tends to illuminate the 'growth of a poet's mind.'

EDITH J. MORLEY.

READING.

LATIN 'PARDUS' AND 'LEOPARDUS' IN THE POPULAR NOMENCLATURE OF FISH.

The name of the leopard has been utilised by naturalists in the nomenclature of the following six fishes, for reasons that will be made clear by the notes added in each case:

1. *Serranus leopardus* Cuv. et Val. (= *Labrus leopardus* Lacépède, *Hist. Nat. des poiss.*, iii (1800), p. 517): it has pale brown spots all over the body, more numerous on the head, back and belly.

2. *Plectropoma leopardinum* Cuv. et Val. (= *Holocentrus leopardus* Lacépède, *Hist. Nat. des poiss.*, iv (1801), pp. 367, 370): it is brownish red, with head, body, vertical fins and base of the pectorals covered with numerous very small round blue spots.

3. *Cybium guttatum* Cuv. et Val. (= *Scomber leopardus* Shaw, *Zoology* (1803), iv, p. 591): its back and sides have numerous round blackish spots.

[1] Cf. MS., ll. 24—27 and ll. 4, 5.
[2] Cf. MS., l. 28. [3] Cf. MS., l. 29.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

4. *Anarrhichas lupus* L. (= *Anarrhichas leopardus* Agassiz, *Selecta genera et species piscium* (1829), p. 92): the body has brown spots; cf. *leopard fish* = the lesser wolf fish (*Anarrhichas minor*) given by Funk and Wagnall's *New Standard Dictionary.*

5. *Rhomboidichthys leopardinus* Günther, *Catalogue,* iv (1862), p. 434: it has numerous ocellated spots.

6. *Nemachilus panthera* Günther (= *Cobitis leopardus* Heckel): its head and body are covered with small irregular black spots and dots.

The object of this note is to show that for similar semantic reasons the name of the leopard occurs in popular fish nomenclature.

In the first place, Rondelet, in the *De Piscibus marinis* (1554), p. 279, says: '*De quinta asellorum specie.* Est etiam inter oceani asinos, is piscis qui a nonnullis molua, ab aliis muschebout, ab aliis leopard a maculis nominatur.' Rondelet's translator, Joubert, *Hist. des poiss.* (1558), p. 221, puts it thus: '*Du muschebout.* Entre les merlus de l'Océan faut nombrer celui qu'aucuns appellent moluë, les autres muschebout, les autres leopard, il se peut nommer en latin *asinus varius*, merlus moucheté.' And in 1611 Cotgrave inserted in his Dictionary an article: '*Leopard de mer.* The cod, or green fish.' Lacépède, in the *Hist. Nat. des poiss.*, ii (1799), p. 409, identified Rondelet's *léopard* with the *Gadus callarias* L., that is, with the young of the *Gadus morrhua* L. or common codfish, which has numerous yellowish or brown spots on the back and on the sides.

A second and more interesting case is offered by the fish-name *lambarda*, first quoted in 1810 for Nice by Risso in his *Ichthyologie de Nice*, p. 30, as the name of the female of his *Squalus catulus* which is no other than the *Pristiurus melanostomus* Bonap. The Frenchified form *lambarde* is noted in Bescherelle's *Dict. National* as 'l'un des noms du squale rousset.' In my note 154 in the *Revue des Langues Romanes*, liv (1911), p. 168, I dealt with this form *lambarda* and explained it as the name of the halberd (at Nice *lambarda*), considering that the name had been given to the *Pristiurus melanostomus* Bonap. on account of its elongated form, its sharp snout and its very arched mouth. I am now satisfied that the name of the halberd was given to the fish by what is called popular etymology, and that *lambarda* replaced an earlier word without the labial nasal and which was a name of the leopard.

The family of sharks called *Scylliidae*, Günther, are commonly called *roussettes* in French and *hounds* in English. The following three species occur in the Mediterranean:

(1) *Scyllium canicula* Cuv. (la *grande roussette* ou *roussette à petites taches*);

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

(2) *Scyllium stellare* Günther (= *Scyllium catulus* Cuv.) (la *petite roussette* ou *roussette à grandes taches*);

(3) *Pristiurus melanostomus* Bonap.

It seems to me that these three fishes, which are not very easy to distinguish, for early naturalists have often confused them, were originally grouped together by fishermen in the Mediterranean as *leopards* on account of their spots.

The following list of popular names for them is taken from Carus, *Prodromus Faunae Mediterraneae*, ii, pp. 508, 509:

(1) *Scyllium canicula* Cuv. Messina: *jattu parda.* Catania: *gattu pardu.* Bari: *liabarda, diabarda.*

(2) *Scyllium stellare* Günther. Genoa: *gatto bardo.* Sardinia: *gattu pardu.* Naples: *gatto pardo.* Sicily: *gattu pardu* (Messina: *jattu pardu.* Girgenti: *labardu*). Bari: *liabardo, diabardo.*

(3) *Pristiurus melanostomus* Bonap. Nice: *lambarda*, (young) *bardoulin.*

Several things occur to one on examining this list. In the first place, fishermen have evidently considered the *Scyllium stellare* Günther as the male in opposition to the *Scyllium canicula* Cuv., the female, and, so far as the *Pristiurus melanostomus* Bonap. is concerned, I recall that Risso definitely says: 'La femelle de cette espèce est connue à Nice sous le nom de *lambarda.*' To such a form as *labardu* at Girgenti, the normal feminine is *labarda.* Popular names of fishes at Nice have in some cases been borrowed from the language of more southern fishermen (Naples, Sicily). At any rate, I take it that *labarda*, originally 'the female leopard' (on account of the fish's spots), came at Nice in contact with *alabarda*, *labarda*, *lambarda*, the originally Germanic name of the halberd, and, on account of the fish's shape, the halberd's name in popular consciousness eliminated the leopard's name which had perhaps for a long time ceased to be felt as the leopard's name at all. In any case, Mistral, in the *Tresor dou Felibrige*, art. *alabardo*, clearly looks upon the Nice fish-name *lambarda* as a metaphorical use of the name of the halberd.

Again in Greek πάρδος, later λεοντόπαρδος, λεόπαρδος occur as names of the leopard. The form πάρδος, L. *pardus*, has survived in the Romance languages as the name of a colour: 'dappled grey, silver grey, grey etc.,' and I have indicated in the *Revue des Langues Romanes*, lii (1909), p. 120, that several fish-names are derived from it: Ital. *pardello* = *Phoxinus laevis* Agassiz, Portug. *pardelha* = *Smaris vulgaris* Cuv. et Val. It is clear that in the fish-names given above from Carus, e.g. *gatto*

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

pardo at Naples, *gatto bardo* at Genoa, *pardo, bardo* are felt as adjectives. I quote the following from the second edition of Casaccia's *Dizionario Genovese*:

> *bardo*, add. Soriano. Aggiunto di color bigio e lionato, serpato di nero; e tal colore, benche si dia in altri animali e in panni, non si dice se non de' gatti, forse perchè i primi gatti di tal colore vennero a noi di Soria: *gatto bardo*, gatto Soriano. *Di néutte i gatti son bardi*; al bujo tutte le gatte son bigie. Dettato prov. che significa: Il passeggiare di notte è pericoloso.

So that the Genovese adjective *bardo* is, just as much as the Neapolitan *pardo*, primitively the Greek name of the leopard.

As might be expected, the word λεόπαρδος is best preserved in the part of Italy nearest to Greece and most affected by Greek: Bari *liabbardu, liabarda*, Girgenti *labardu*; and this rather supports the contention that the Niçois *lambarda* in its original form was borrowed from the language of a more southern port. The *b* of these forms can be compared with the *b* of one of the Old French forms; Old French has *leupart* (*Chanson de Roland*, 1111: 'Plus se fait fiers que leün ne leuparz'), but also *leubart* (G. de St Pair, *Roman du Mont S. Michel*, ed. Redlich, 1640: 'Proz e hardiz comme leubart').

And this brings me to my last point. Writing in my note 133 in the *Revue des Langues Romanes*, liv (1911), p. 154, on the word *bardoulin*, the name, at Nice, of the young of the *Pristiurus melanostomus* Bonap., I made the suggestion that it might belong to the root of the Italian *bardotto* 'beast of burden' (Arabic *barda'ah* in Meyer-Lübke, *Roman. Etym. Wtb.*, art. 955). This idea must, I feel clear, be given up. I propose to look upon *bardoulin* as a double diminutive of the root which was primitively used as the name of the leopard. As a diminutive it would be given as a name to the young of the fish of the *Scylliidae* Günther; and if Vérany quotes it for Nice as the name of the *Spinax niger* Cloquet, and Risso gives for Nice *bardoulin de fount* = *Laemargus rostratus* M. and Hle, it is due to confusion, and is to be explained by the fact that these two sharks, which belong to other families than the *Scylliidae*, are smaller than any of the three fishes which originally bore the name of the leopard. I see that E. Marcialis in his *Piccolo Vocabolario Sardo-Italiano* (*Fauna del golfo di Cagliari*), 1913, p. 21, gives *sonaiolus* as the local name of the *Scyllium canicula* Cuv. and adds that its name in Venice is *bardolino*. One would like some confirmation of this, as the name is quoted for Venice by no other source available to me, and no other names connected with the name of the leopard are given elsewhere for the North Adriatic.

PAUL BARBIER.

LEEDS.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Notes on Old High German Texts.

Hildebrandslied.

21 b. Saran (*Das Hildebrandslied*, 1915, § 19) and H. G. Atkins (*History of German Versification*, 1923, pp. 66, 76) class *barn unwachsan* as of Type D. But why give *un-* a stronger stress than *wachs-*? In Cynewulf's *Elene*, 529 (*ðus mec fæder mīn...*) *unweaxenne wordum lærde*, the alliteration leaves no doubt as to the accentuation of the same word in eighth-century Anglo-Saxon. As far as my experience goes, students always read 21 b instinctively as of Type A. They may be right.

38. Half of this line is missing. It is impossible to believe with Ehrismann (*Gesch. der deutschen Lit.*, I, 1918, p. 376) that *mit geru scal man geba infahan, ort widar orte* is a proverb based on general experience. From *Beowulf* and other sources we know that the old Nordic-Gothic heroes were credited with good manners. They gladly and gratefully accepted gifts. They were not a churlish, ill-conditioned crew, burdened with an inferiority complex. Hadubrand's refusal is a special case, prompted by the spirit of *timeo Danaos et dona ferentes*. Originally the sentence must have been completed by *sô se ôstarman biutit*, or something of the kind. For other suggestions for the missing half-line see Steinmeyer, *Sprachdenkmäler*, 1916, p. 5. Ehrismann might with advantage consult the Anglo-Saxon Rune-Song on *Gifu*.

63. An argument against Collitz's *asck im* (*asck*, acc. sing.) for *asckim* (instr.-dat. pl., Grimm, IV, p. 709), an emendation which Mansion adopts and Steinmeyer doubts, is that in every other instance when both combatants are in question, their arms and equipment are given in the plural: *saro, guđhamun, suert, hregilo, brunnono, sciltim, staimbort, scilti, lintun* are all plural. The idiom of *lęttun scrîtan* with the instrumental, though it has puzzled German scholars from J. Grimm onwards—see his extraordinary efforts (IV, pp. 640, 709) to explain it—seems very natural on the analogy of 'he let fly with a stone,' or 'he let drive with a sledge-hammer.' Is there anything like this in Frisian?

65.

Braune, 1907:	dô stôpun tô samane staimbortchludun,
Mansion, 1912:	Do stoptun to samane staim, bort chludun,
The Manuscript:	do stoptũ tosamane staim bort chludun.

Mansion, p. 130, finds this line almost unintelligible, and all attempts at interpretation very doubtful. A fresh attempt, if equally unsuccessful, will fail in good company.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Braune's remark (*Ahd. Lesebuch*, p. 185) that the obscure *staim bort chludun* are thus separated in the MS. is a little misleading. The separation of *staim* from *bort* may be merely accidental. The facsimile in Mansion's *Ahd. Lesebuch*, or the unreduced photograph in the collection edited by Magda Enneccerus, 1897, shows *staim* at the end of a line, where there is not room for the next syllable. This also happens with *uual* and *tan*, *gi* and *winnan* on the same page, but nobody would propose to read anything but *uualtan*, *giwinnan*. O.H.G. *staim* would be M.H.G. *steim*. The dictionaries give one example of *steim*, in the sense of 'Gewühl, Gedränge, Getümmel,' and in Müller-Zarncke it is associated with this very *staimbort*, which seems to be an epic 'kenning' for *scilti* in l. 66, just as in *Beowulf* we find *hildebord* or *wīg-bord* for 'shield.'

Those who follow Lachmann with *stôpun* change a transitive into an intransitive verb. The MS. makes it preferable to take *stôptun*, with Mansion, as the preterite of O.S. *stôpian*, a factitive verb, related to *stapan*, *stôp*, st. VI (gehen, schreiten, cf. *Hêliand*, 4875) in the same way as *führen* to *fahren*, or *set* to *sit*; *stôptun* being then an equivalent to *lęttun scrîtan* in l. 63.

The last word of the line I take to be acc. pl. neut. wk. decl. of the adjective *hlûd* (O.S.; O.H.G. *hlût*)[1], precisely as *beorhtan* is acc. pl. masc. wk. decl. in postposition without article in *Beowulf*, 1243:

> Setton him to hēafdon hilde-randas,
> bord-wudu beorhtan.

Grimm, IV, p. 574, cites some instances of the weak adjective without article in O.H.G., as Otfrid's *engil gotes guato*, and a few in O.S., to which Schlüter (1892) and Behaghel (1897) have added; and remarks that more examples are offered by A.S. and O.N. poetry, especially in epic epithets. Lichtenheld (*Zeitschr. f. deut. Altert.*, XVI, 1873) finds that in *Beowulf* weak adjectives without the article are more frequent than with the article (p. 369), and confirms Grimm's idea that the weak form is emphatic (pp. 363, 365).

The only difficulty is the initial *ch*. This might be explained either as an affective intensification of the aspirate—if *chlûdun* means what I think, it would be spoken with more force than the strong decl. adjective *huîttę* in l. 66—or, perhaps more simply, by Latin influence. Whoever wrote down this line of the *Hildebrandslied* must have been a learned person, whose literary activity would be concerned more with Latin than with German. A western European man of letters without

[1] Professor R. Priebsch has kindly pointed out to me that the possibility of taking *chludun* as an adjective was admitted in the edition by the brothers Grimm, 1812, p. 24. It is strange that Braune, Steinmeyer, etc. do not mention this.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Latin about 800 A.D. would be a contradiction in terms. A usual Latin spelling for aspirated *l* was *chl*. as in *Chlodovechus* for *Hluduig*.

Thus, without swerving a hair's breadth from our best authority, the unique manuscript, we arrive at the following reading:

dô stôptun tô samane staimbort chlûdun,

and the interpretation: 'da stießen (sie) zusammen (ihre) Streitbretter (die) lautschallenden,' 'then dashed together their resounding shields.' For the epithet one might adduce the 'echoing shields' in Macpherson's *Ossian*, Tegnér's 'sköldars dån' (*Frithiofs Saga*, Song 23), or 'Clashed on their sounding shields the din of war' (*Paradise Lost*, I, 668). And I must not omit to direct attention to the noise of shields in what is probably the most important quarter, in Anglo-Saxon poetry, for example *Judith*, 204–5: 'dynedan scildas, hlūde hlummon.' A free rendering of l. 65 in English might run:

their shields
Dash'd with a clang together,

which may possibly have a familiar ring. I confess the words are not my own. They come from Matthew Arnold's *Sohrab and Rustum*, where the two Persian warriors rush together 'as two eagles on one prey come rushing down together from the clouds,' and the fatal conflict between father and son runs the same course as in the *Hildebrandslied*.

Muspilli, 15.

The sense here is greatly improved by the change of a single letter, reading *salida*, happiness, for *selida*, a dwelling. Both words occur in *Otfrid* I, 7, l. 24: *so fuar si z'iro selidon mit allen salidon*. We then have three parallels, a triple antithesis of perfect poise, descriptive of the unalloyed joys of Paradise:

dâr ist lîp âno tôd, lioht âno finstrî,
sâlida âno sorgûn:

'There is life without death, light without darkness, bliss without sorrow.' A similar arrangement of three pairs of opposites is to be found in Cynewulf's *Elene*, 306–7:

swā gē mōdblinde mengan ongunnon
lige wiđ sōđe, lēoht wiđ þȳstrum,
æfst wiđ āre.

Otfrid, I, 13, l. 4.

Ilemes nu alle zi themo kastelle,
Thaz wir ouh mit then gouuon thaz gotes wort scouuon,

rendering Luke ii, 15: *Transeamus usque Bethlehem, et videamus hoc verbum*. Mansion (*Ahd. Lesebuch*, 1912, p. 121) remarks that the sense is

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

not plain, after quoting Erdmann's conjecture that *gouuon*, like Gothic *gaujans* in Luke iii, 3 and viii, 37, means the inhabitants of the country round about (Gaubewohnern)—a meaning which is not found elsewhere in German. It is unlikely that Otfrid would deviate from authority by introducing these other persons into the sacred story to no purpose; they are not further mentioned. Probably we have to do with a scribal error, easily rectified by transferring the letter *g* to the place of the second *u*: *óugon* for *góuuon*. Compare II, 14, l. 105: *Nu sehet, mit then ougon biginnet umbiscouuon.* It is undoubted that Codex V embodies the autograph corrections of the author, but that does not prove the text faultless. The (Otfridian) rhyme *ougon—scouuon* recurs at least a dozen times in the course of the *Evangelienbuch*. Its familiarity may explain why Otfrid, when revising the scribe's labours, did not scrutinize this line letter by letter with his usual care.

W. PERRETT.

LONDON.

Digitized by Google

Original from
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

REVIEWS.

Guy of Warwick, nach Coplands Druck. Herausgegeben von GUSTAV SCHLEICH. (*Palaestra*, CXXXIX.) Berlin: Mayer und Müller. 1923. 274 pp. 7M.

The chief merit of this book is that it completes the British Museum copy of Copland's printed version from the Garrick collection (C21.c68), which is defective in lines 1–1091, with the aid of a transcript made by Furnivall for Zupitza from 'Mr Locker-Lampson's copy,' which contains lines 1–2164. And so for the first time the Elizabethan version in its complete form is made accessible.

It is, as the editor remarks, a version that 'aus keiner anderen uns bekannten englischen Fassung stammen kann,' unless, as Zupitza conjectured, it was based on an earlier printed version of which one leaf remains in the Bodleian (Douce Fragments, 20), printed in the same type as that used by Wynkyn de Worde for 'Bevis of Hampton' and 'Robyn Hode.' In any case it is the sole complete specimen of a translation made later than the Auchinleck, Caius, and Cambridge University MS. versions of the romance. It has the merit of being slightly less diffuse than the other translations. The author managed to pack his story into 7976 lines of London English, riming in free, or shall we say rugged, short couplets; whereas the translator of the Auchinleck version needed 10,479, the Caius translator 11,095, and the translator of the MS. in Cambridge University Library 11,976 lines. The printed version of Copland follows the usual scheme of the romance. The story of Guy's love for Felice is followed by a series of adventures in which the hero always triumphs, culminating in the fight with the dragon of Northumberland, after which Guy is married to Felice, but quickly resolves to embark on a pilgrimage to the Holy Land, and forthwith engages in another series of right doughty deeds of prise; and then, after saving Athelstan from the Danes by a victory in single combat over the giant Colbrand, Guy ends his life as a hermit in religious seclusion. Thereupon follows the story of Reinbrun. Professor Schleich has compiled a useful comparative table of the contents of all the versions, from which it appears that the only improvement added to the story by Copland's translator was the account of the angel who appeared to Felice in a vision, telling her to 'Despise not Guy,'—an episode which is paralleled in the chap-book version (called by Ellis 'the modern abridgment in prose, or rather perhaps in blank-verse printed like prose') by the vision of Chapter II, in which Cupid appears to Felice and commands her to 'use him well and kindly.'

Professor Schleich has shrunk from the task of researching into the origin and transmission of the romance. He has not even discovered

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

the present locality of 'Mr Locker-Lampson's copy,' though he surmises that it is now in the British Museum under press-mark C 18 . e 1 . (49) IA 55,533; surely a postcard would have decided this important point. He dismisses the problem of relationship by accepting the genealogy of MSS. produced by Weyrauch in his Breslau dissertation, *Die mittelenglischen fassungen der sage von Guy of Warwick und ihre altfranzösische vorlage*, 1899, p. 66; and by saying: 'Näher mich mit diesen Fragen zu befassen, verbietet mir die Beschränkung meiner Einsicht in die französischen Quellen und dürfte auch über mein Hauptziel, eine sorgfältige Ausgabe von d zu bieten, hinausgehen.' The literary interest of the romance, its English source, its picture of courtly and religious life, the author's intention, and his amazing success which is so incomprehensible to us to-day, he neglects entirely.

If it be a merit to produce a transcript of an early text in the orthography of the original, but with ' v bezw. j für konsonantisches u bezw. i,' there is merit in this work. If, on the other hand, an editor should be historian, critic, and interpreter, as well as a grammarian and a heedful clerk, we fear that Professor Gustav Schleich's literary industry will leave readers with a sense of disappointment that with such interesting material at his disposal he has discovered so little of interest and value to whet their curiosity and their imagination.

GEORGE H. COWLING.

LEEDS.

Pearl, Cleanness, Patience, and Sir Gawain. Reproduced in Facsimile from the unique MS. Cotton Nero A. x in the British Museum, with Introduction by SIR I. GOLLANCZ. (Early English Text Society, Original Series, CLXII.) London: H. Milford, 1923. Imp. 8vo. 44 + 180 pp. £3. 3*s*.

All real lovers of English literature will rejoice that a complete reproduction of this important and baffling manuscript is at last available and will gratefully congratulate Sir Israel Gollancz and those others who by their assistance and support have enabled the long-projected task to be accomplished. The facsimile is an appropriate memorial by the Early English Text Society of its founder, F. J. Furnivall, to whose memory it is inscribed, and its appearance last summer recalled in fitting wise the generosity of another great scholar, whose loss we had then to mourn, W. P. Ker.

The publication will at once enable students to settle for themselves two points of controversy with regard to these poems. One is the alleged quatrain division of the purely alliterative items. Whatever their authority and significance may be, marks do indubitably occur after each four lines in the manuscript and not (as I confess I was once tempted to suppose) only in the editor's imagination. They would seem, however, to be due rather to the scribe than to the author, since where the quatrain structure admittedly breaks down near the end of *Patience*

Digitized by Google Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

the division marks run regularly on as if nothing had happened. The other point concerns the queer spellings 'hatz,' 'watz,' etc. It was once suggested that the scribe's 't' and 'c' were not distinguishable and that it was consequently impossible to say whether 'hatz' or 'hacz' was intended, and in his first edition of *Pearl* the present editor actually adopted the latter spelling. He has since recanted the heresy and now prints 'hatz,' etc.[1] The fact is that though, as in most middle-English hands, there tends to be some confusion between 't' and 'c,' the two are in general clearly distinguished by the scribe, and there is no doubt whatever that 'hatz' and not 'hacz' is what he meant to write.

It was rather injudicious of the editor to challenge criticism by the remark that the facsimile is 'excellently reproduced'—in any case it is not the facsimile that is reproduced. The collotypes are very fair, but by no means first rate. (In view of the imprint it may be well to mention that they are not the work of the Oxford University Press.) Some pages, not always those where the original was most easily rendered, are distinctly good (e.g. fols. 46ᵃ, 47ᵇ), but many of the plates have a very flat appearance. Moreover, the text occasionally fades off into vagueness in a manner for which there seems nothing in the original to account, and which must therefore, I suppose, be due to unskilful illumination. Here and there too the text is rendered illegible through flaws in the plates (e.g. on fol. 40ᵃ). The defects of workmanship are most obvious in the reproductions of the illustrations: that on fol. 125ᵇ is hardly intelligible. But these were, of course, by far the most difficult part of the task and to have made the work satisfactory in this respect would probably have demanded more time and labour than the exceedingly inferior miniatures were worth. It is the imperfections of the text that really matter, especially if there is any reason to suppose that the state of the original is deteriorating.

At the beginning of his introduction the editor tells us that the handwriting of the book 'is slowly fading'; at the end, having worked himself up into a lyrical mood, it becomes 'the fast-fading manuscript'. The first statement is, I suppose, true of all, or nearly all, middle-English manuscripts; the second there is happily no reason to suppose true at all, and some reason definitely to reject. That the manuscript has faded considerably in places is certain, but it has hardly suffered more than most others of its age; apart from accidental damage it seldom approaches illegibility, while in those passages where it has been touched up by some reader, who already found the writing faint perhaps in the fifteenth or sixteenth century, there is no indication that the neighbouring text has altered considerably since his day.

What one chiefly looks for in the introduction to a facsimile is information upon those points on which the original affords evidence which the facsimile is incapable of reproducing. These are as a rule

[1] According to the present introduction, he considers 't$\mathfrak{z}$ = z or s' to be 'derived evidently from an Anglo-French scribal mannerism.' He refers to the 'article on Z in *N.E.D.*', but that does not appear to afford any support to his view.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

bibliographical points of a rather technical character, though they may be of great importance for the history of the work. So far as I have had opportunity of examining it, the present Cottonian manuscript affords but poor sport in this respect, and most of the scanty quarry has been duly harboured. At first sight the list of textual emendations which occupies five-sixths of the introduction may seem rather irrelevant, but on examination it proves to be largely concerned with questions of decipherment on which the original naturally throws clearer light than the facsimile, and a discussion of which is therefore both appropriate and welcome. I have, however, an impression that, in spite of the obviously minute care that has been spent upon them, some of the readings may fail to commend themselves to palaeographers. There are a few definite errors. Thus on fol. 67^{b}, l. 22, the note runs: '*sorewe* (*we* by a later hand, also responsible for *so*; the original word was *care*, the initial of which is faintly visible)'. This, it will be seen, implies that the letters 're' are by the original not the later hand. This is not so. The whole word 'sorewe' is in one hand of the fifteenth century. That the original reading was 'care' seems probable, but the whole word has been erased: various slight traces are visible but nothing that can be certainly identified. Or again, in a passage where the text is a good deal rubbed, fol. 60^{a}, l. 13, we read: '*ȝisse* (the scribe had evidently written *þ*, which he changed into *ȝ*, but the word, especially the last two letters, is well nigh faded)'. Here Morris read '*þis*', querying '*ȝis*', whether as an alternative or an emendation is not clear. Menner read '*þis*', noting 'upper part of *þ* indistinct'. The first letter is certainly obscure, but it seems unlikely that there has been any alteration; while there is no room for more than three letters, and it is very doubtful whether there is any trace of others having been subsequently crowded in. I may mention that, with the exception of the one to *Gawain*, these lists of readings are not new but are reprinted from the editor's previous editions.

The few pages of introduction devoted to a description of the manuscript are in general adequate and relevant, though there are a number of minor points that seem open to criticism. I will note a few that have struck me. In the first place one would like to hear rather more of what 'experts' have to say of the handwriting. I do not feel certain that it necessarily belongs quite to 'the end' of the fourteenth century, any more than I am convinced that that of the third section of the volume belongs to 'the end' of the thirteenth (the 'Epitaphium de Ranulfo' [not 'Ranulpho'] is in a different and possibly later hand, and he died in 1253). Of course if by 'the end' is meant the second half, it is true enough, but if the last decade or so is intended the attribution is less certainly correct. I notice that the editor speaks of 'the scribe (or scribes)' of the poems. This is curious. I believe it has always been assumed since Madden's day that one main scribe was responsible for the whole, and I think that most students with the facsimile now before them will agree that this is so, though the writing perhaps tends to grow smaller and more spiky towards the end. Anyhow if the sugges-

Digitized by Google

Original from
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

tion has any basis one would have liked to hear more of it. (Perhaps, however, the editor had successive scribes in mind.)

The folios of the manuscript have at some time been numbered in ink from 37 to 126, and since these form the only guide to the order of the leaves of the facsimile, it was obviously necessary that they should be used for purposes of reference, but it ought to have been added that the modern pencil numbering runs from 41 to 130. That the initials are 'of blue, flourished with red' is generally true only of the small ones used for minor distinctions; the large ones beginning the four poems usually contain both colours apart from the flourishes. What is intended by the statement that 'it seems likely that *Gawain* may have been copied from a MS. of a different type' from the rest I do not know.

I do not remember ever to have seen mention of the incomplete inscription (there is no erasure) in a fifteenth century hand at the head of *Gawain* (fol. 91ª): 'Hugo de'. It may be a mere pen-trial: on the other hand, if it could be interpreted it might afford a clue to the history of the manuscript.

Most of the space not devoted to the lists of emendations is occupied by an account of the illustrations which would have been improved by greater attention to accuracy. The colours used are only given for the pictures to *Pearl* (they are in fact the same throughout) and only four are enumerated, green, red, blue, and yellow: to these should be added white and brown. It is implied that the garb of the dreamer is the same in the second picture as in the first, which is not the case. In the illustration facing the beginning of *Patience* it is possible that the grotesque figure on the right may stand for the 'sottez for madde' of l. 509, but the fact can hardly be indicated by there being 'a characteristic fool's jagged collar round his neck', for the garment he wears is the same as the dreamer's hood in the first picture to *Pearl*! To suppose that the name of 'Agravayn a la dure main' could be 'indicated by the scimitar-like weapon in his hand' is surely fantastic.

The illustrations are a rather perplexing problem. 'But for the fact that several...are in the body of the MS.' the editor thinks that 'one might have inferred from the isolated pictures at the beginning and end that the illustrations were of a later date.' If there is any general ground for believing the pictures to be late the supposed obstacle need not trouble us. The scribe may easily have left a leaf blank at the end of *Pearl* (which concludes on a verso) and a page blank after both *Cleanness* and *Patience* (which end on rectos). His object may have been merely to mark the divisions between the poems, each of which begins on a recto, but since he evidently aimed at having a blank verso facing each of these rectos it is more likely that there was an express intent that one miniature should be prefixed to each poem. For this purpose also an independent fold (of two leaves) was added at the beginning. In point of fact we find the four pages of the preliminary fold, both sides of the leaf at the end of *Pearl*, the blank portion of the leaf below the last lines of *Cleanness* and the following page, the blank page after *Patience*, and the four blank pages which complete the last

Digitized by Google

Original from
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

quire (of four) of *Gawain*, all filled with painting. This was clearly not the original intention. Moreover there is some direct evidence that the illustrations were added later. At the head of fol. 125ª stands an isolated and enigmatical couplet. It is said to be in a different hand from the preceding text, and I agree that this is probable[1]. In that case it is certainly later, though the interval may not have been long. But the illustration is clearly later than the couplet which it avoids. Again, there are two holes (now repaired) in the inner margin of fol. 82 and the painting and design on the recto of this leaf are carried through the holes onto fol. 83ª, showing that the picture was painted after the sheets had been sewn and probably after the volume was bound. Now, although our knowledge of the habits of miniaturists is imperfect, the inconvenience of painting in a bound book is so great, especially if the book is small, that we are justified in supposing that whenever possible a manuscript was illuminated while still in loose sheets. Taking the whole evidence together, therefore, I think that there is little doubt that, whatever the original intention may have been, the actual illustrations now found in the volume are an afterthought of later date. Unfortunately the details of the armour are too obscure to afford any help towards the more accurate dating of the pictures, but at least we need not be influenced by the latter to ascribe a later date to the handwriting than other evidence entails.

The editor further remarks that 'On the whole, the drawing of the artist in the illustrations found in the body of the MS. gives the impression of better composition than the illustrations to *Pearl*.' This is true; but if it is intended to hint that more than one hand may have been concerned in the drawing, I do not think that the suggestion will bear close scrutiny. The drawing indeed varies to some extent, but the same characteristics are traceable throughout, and it would have been a malicious fate that should have delivered this otherwise pleasing manuscript into the hands of two such very incompetent amateurs. Were it not for this last consideration one might be tempted to wonder whether the colouring was not the work of a different hand from the drawing. More helpless even than the pen-work, it often obscures such small merit as the latter possesses. It is significant that Belshazzar's feast, certainly the most successful picture, is also the least coloured. As a rule the pigment is applied in the crudest manner, and at times it obliterates the drawing altogether. This may be verified by examining the verso of fol. 126 (which should have been reproduced) when it will be seen that the arch or canopy in the illustration on the recto was much more elaborately decorated than now appears through the heavy paint. Still, hands should not be multiplied any more than other entities, and it is perhaps not surprising that the 'artist' who drew

[1] What can have suggested to the editor that 'The handwriting seems to be the artist's' I am at a loss to guess. He refers in a note to his recent edition of *Pearl*. There we read: 'Perhaps in a musing mood he [the poet!] wrote in the blank space at the head of one of the illustrations in his [!] MS. the suggestive couplet.' Few things are less likely. I also venture to question the paraphrase that follows—but that is another matter.

Digitized by Google

Original from
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

these queer pictures should have been unable to refrain from rendering his work yet less attractive through the use of his child's paintbox.

W. W. GREG.

LONDON.

Hamlet: its Textual History. An Inquiry into the Relations between the First and Second Quartos and the First Folio of *Hamlet*. By H. DE GROOT. Amsterdam: Swets & Zeitlinger. 1923. 8vo. 143 pp.

This substantial pamphlet is well written by a Dutch scholar and well printed at a Dutch press, but it does not materially advance the problems with which it deals, and its argument is seldom cogent. Two criticisms suggest themselves at the outset. One is that the space devoted to summarizing the views of previous writers is largely wasted. The critical position could be put quite briefly, and nothing is to be gained by raking up the imbecilities of Messrs Tanger and Bijvanck. The other is that the author is very unwise to exclude from consideration *Der bestrafte Brudermord*. Explicit treatment may not be necessary; but, on the one hand, no theory of the English texts can stand that does not allow of a reasonable explanation of the German play, and, on the other, in such a desperately difficult problem as the present we should welcome every shred of available evidence.

I am afraid Dr de Groot hardly realizes either the difficulty of his task or the deficiency of his own equipment. His knowledge, for one thing, is not up to date. Harvey's mention of an early Shakespearian *Hamlet* is extant and cannot be dismissed with a slighting reference to Steevens (see G. C. M. Smith, *Harvey's Marginalia*, 1913). The reputed lines of Kyd, 'It is an hell in hatefull vassallage,' etc., are not from an 'Ur-Hamlet' (or any other Chaldean absurdity) but from Sylvester's *Du Bartas* misassigned by Allot (see *England's Parnassus*, ed. C. Crawford, 1913). Worse, his judgment is often unsound. Most critics now assume an early *Hamlet* by Kyd, but to say that Sarrazin or anyone else has 'established Kyd's authorship as a fact' is a misuse of language. Wolff's theory that Kyd's *Hamlet* was an academic play is not a point on which 'most modern critics are agreed'; most are likely to regard its ready acceptance as a sign of perversity. In III, iii, 79 'base and silly' (Q 2) cannot have been the original reading, altered later to 'hyre and Sallery' (F): it must be a corruption. To suggest that the 'adapter' in Q 1 having cut a passage was troubled because what remained 'had become too abrupt' is unreasonable: the man who, on the showing, was responsible for the absurd mutilations of this text was incapable of any such consideration. Lastly, the picture of the early critics comparing 'the newly discovered *Hamlet*-text [Q 1] with the carefully edited text with which they were familiar' and being thus misled into evolving a special 'mutilation-theory' is based on assumptions for which there is not the least warrant.

Dr de Groot formulates his views upon two aspects of the problem—aspects which are of very different importance—the relation of Q 2 to

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

F, and the nature of Q 1. Contrary to the generally received opinion that Q 2 and F are derived from separate manuscripts, he believes that F was printed from a copy of Q 2 which had been used and marked by the prompter, and for this he seems to claim Mr A. W. Pollard's authority. Mr Pollard has of course argued (what is indeed obvious) that many of the plays in the folio were printed from earlier quartos, but the point is one to be proved in each individual case by bibliographical evidence, and I am quite sure that Mr Pollard would be the first to protest against the assumption underlying the present writer's treatment, namely that F must be assumed to be printed from Q 2 unless this can be proved impossible. I have not examined the question myself and have no prejudice one way or the other, but Dr de Groot's arguments hardly touch it. He contents himself with showing how, in his opinion, various obvious objections might be met; of positive argument in favour of his theses he offers next to none[1]. This aspect of the problem, however, though of importance textually, does not fundamentally affect the history of the play.

In his treatment of Q 1 the writer throughout has Mr Dover Wilson in view. The latter's theory postulates: (1) an early *Hamlet* by Kyd, (2) a partial revision of (1) by Shakespeare, (3) a stage-abridgment of (2) for provincial performance, (4) a piratical revision of (3) by an actor in the final Shakespearian version, (5) the printing of (4) as Q 1. Dr de Groot simply proposes to cut out (4) and pass straight from (3) to (5). The argument is naturally rather technical. I do not think Mr Wilson will have much difficulty in keeping his end up against the present bowling, but I do not propose to queer the pitch by attempting to take his place. There is, however, one point of view which I should like to put, since I doubt whether it will commend itself to either champion. This is that memorial corruption plays a greater part in Q 1 than most modern critics are willing to recognize. To take an instance almost at random: Q 2 says of the Ghost:

> And then it started like a guilty thing,
> Vpon a fearefull summons;

while in Q 1 it 'faded', and we are told there has been 'revision'. But Q 2 gives the *natural* reading: no one composing freely would have written the passage as in Q 1; this is the makeshift of a reporter at a loss for a word and supplying something he fancies equivalent but which happens not to fit the context. So, a few lines later in I, i, we have 'the morne in russet mantle clad' (Q 2), which is not only an exquisite poetic image but is good sense: Q 1 gives us 'the Sunne', which is not. Again we are invited to see 'revision'! But even Dr de Groot cannot believe (as Professor Hubbard apparently can) that either Kyd or Shakespeare wrote the 'To be or not to be' speech as it stands in Q 1.

[1] One quotation, III, ii, 262 (Globe—to give references to the Arden edition is sheer perversity), must be allowed some weight if the *textus receptus*—Pope's—is correct: but is it? query 'mis-take'.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

For in that dreame of death, when wee awake,
And borne before an euerlasting Iudge,
From whence no passenger euer return'd,
The vndiscouered country, at whose sight
The happy smile, and the accursed damn'd.

So the 'ignorant adapter' is invoked, who 'made some awkward cuts, so that the great soliloquy has become a sad jumble'! It has indeed, and a similar fate befel an earlier passage, concerning the poison 'whose effect'

Holds such an enmitie with blood of man,
That swift as quickesiluer, it posteth through
The naturall gates and allies of the body,
And turnes the thinne and wholesome blood
Like eager dropings into milke.
And all my smoothe body, barked, and tetterd ouer.

(Even Professor Hubbard can't quite swallow this!) To me it seems manifest that these passages are mere patchwork of half-remembered tags strung together by a reporter as best he could[1].

I believe the 'ignorant adapter' to be a chimera, like the 'careless transcriber' and the 'illiterate compositor' so dear to earlier critics. In a genuine stage-abridgment, such as Peele's *Battle of Alcazar*, you get manifest dislocations and abrupt and awkward transitions, but you do not get sheer absurdity. It is not the first time we have been asked to accept this play-house hack, who, when called upon to shorten a speech, instead of simply striking out superfluous lines goes to the trouble of re-writing it as nonsense—for that is what it comes to. Dr de Groot apparently can believe in him: I can't. However, there is no knowing what one may achieve with practice. A certain august lady had learned to believe as many as six impossible things before breakfast.

W. W. Greg.

London.

Studies in the Development of the Fool in the Elizabethan Drama. By Olive Mary Busby. London: H. Milford. 1923. 8vo. 87 pp. 3*s.* 6*d.*

This is a work of quite appreciable merit. The author knows her subject and writes of it with insight and common sense, in an easy and agreeable manner free from the crudity of thought and expression frequent in academic dissertations (though one sentence on p. 36 is of very doubtful meaning). That hers is a work of profound research or that it adds notably to our stock of knowledge it would be idle to pretend, but

[1] Mr Dover Wilson's theory of course allows us to suppose memorial reconstruction, but only of the final-*Hamlet*. It occurs to me to wonder whether the 'To be or not to be' speech in Q 1 is indeed only early-*Hamlet* contaminated by recollections of the final-*Hamlet*, or whether we may not be forced to postulate memorial corruption of the early text also. Mr Wilson's theory commits us to the proposition that wherever there is memorial corruption we are dealing with final-*Hamlet* material. Of course from the nature of the case it is exceedingly difficult to prove memorial corruption except in relation to the final-*Hamlet*, i.e. Q 2.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

it traces the relation of vice to fool and of fool to clown in a comprehensive way, at once with grasp and freshness.

In choosing a purely 'literary' subject, or perhaps I should say in treating it in a purely 'literary' manner, Miss Busby has evidently consulted her taste and aptitude, but it is a pity that even the most literary of subjects should not be handled with a scholarly touch, and the present author's work would have benefited greatly by a severer training. She shows that she can cut to the root of things when she writes of the difficulty of tracing chronological development 'since the whole Elizabethan drama was compressed into such a short space of time that plays representing very different stages appeared almost simultaneously.' But that is no excuse for obscuring chronological relations. Miss Busby dates *Friar Bacon* '1589–90,' and *James IV* '1598,' and speaks of 'the ten years which elapsed between the appearances of Greene's two clowns.' But 1589–90 is merely Gayley's guess at the date of composition of *Friar Bacon*, while 1598 is the date of the earliest known edition of *James IV* (six years after Greene's death). The 'ten years' are pure fiction. Throughout dates are given in the same slip-shod fashion. *Wily Beguiled* is dated '1606' (the date of printing) though it is probably much older; *The Old Law* is dated '*c.* 1599' (a guess of Fleay's) though it was not printed till 1656. Miss Busby follows Collier in misdating *John a Kent* '1595,' and what she means by the 'first transcript' of the play she alone can tell. Her insight too fails at times as when she says that 'In the Middle Ages liberty of speech could only be enjoyed under the mask of folly' and again that 'a satirical commentary on the life and events of the times [was] then impossible except under the protection of the cap and bells.' These are *clichés* the absurdity of which is proved by *Piers Plowman*, by Petrarch's political sonnets, and fifty other works. Again one may question whether it was one of the 'offices of the court fool' to break bad news. Instances can be quoted, but that is a very different matter. A particularly irritating trick is the constant allusion to clown-characters by name without mention of the play in which they occur. No one can be expected to carry all these fools in his head. If the author wished, naturally enough, to avoid constant repetition of the titles, she should have provided an index. More attention too should have been paid to linguistic evidence. There is no reason to suppose that Henslowe's 'sewt of motley for the scotchman' means a fool's dress: 'motley' was any parti-coloured stuff and probably here means tartan. On the same page we are told that 'a guarded coat...appears to mean a fool's coat.' This is certainly not generally true; what does seem likely is that some particular class of fools wore guarded coats.

The want of scholarly care appears most markedly in the references. I observe that a certain manuscript play is throughout called *Thomas of Woodstock*. This title has, indeed, been recently proposed for what has twice been printed as *Richard II*, but is not yet generally accepted, and to use it without further explanation is most misleading. In support of the statement that 'the fool proper...was an institution by the fifteenth century' (which is true enough) we are told that 'An engraving of a

Digitized by Google Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

morris dance dating from about 1460 shows a fool,' but no authority is quoted. If the engraving intended is that by Israel von Mechelen, it should have been mentioned that the evidence is not English but Flemish. The reference (for Pedrolino) 'Scala, *Faithful Pilgrim Lover*' is merely bewildering; 'See Feuillerat, *Documents*, p. 225, &c.' merely ignorant (M. Feuillerat has edited at least three important collections); 'Rowlands' *Let Humours Blood*' merely slovenly. For the pin of a jig-dance we are referred to the hay-stack '*Pauli Hentzerii* [sic] *Itinerarium Germaniæ, Angliæ, Italiæ, &c.*,' a reference which it would be safe to set down as second-hand were it not so much of a piece with the rest.

The work is 'A Thesis approved for the Degree of Master of Arts in the University of London.' It is written with ability and an original knowledge of the literature discussed, which is a very great merit. But there is no evidence that Miss Busby has received any training whatever during her university course. She has written this considerable thesis—one I repeat that was well worth writing—apparently in complete ignorance of the standard work on the subject. That is admittedly Eduard Eckhardt's monograph, *Die lustige Person im älteren englischen Drama* (Berlin, 1902). Of this she makes no mention though she does quote L. W. Cushman's earlier, slighter, and less satisfactory study of *The Devil and the Vice* (Halle, 1900). Similarly, in discussing the dress of fools, though she mentions A. Gazeau, *Les Bouffons* (1882), she is apparently ignorant of Douce's important dissertation in his *Illustrations of Shakespeare*. I do not know whether the University of London sets out to supervise in any way the work of its post-graduate students, but if it does one is left wondering who Miss Busby's director of studies can have been.

LONDON. W. W. GREG.

A Fruitefull Sermon upon part of the 5. Chapter of the first Epistle of Saint Paul to the Thessalonians. By HENRIE SMITH. *Which Sermon being taken by characterie is now republished with the authentic version.* By H. T. PRICE. Halle: Max Niemeyer. 1922. xxxii + 41 pp. 2 M. 50.

Dr Price's reprint of this sermon of Henry Smith's in two texts, one 'taken by characterie,' the other presented to us as 'authentic,' is so honest a piece of spadework that it deserves more notice than it has received. In his Introduction he states his own object in reprinting the texts, as follows:

For some time there has been a strange divergence of opinion about the 'bad' Quartos of Shakespeare's plays. Many scholars are inclined to explain their inferiority on the theory that they are surreptitious versions of a first sketch, of which the Folio or 'good' Quartos give a later revised text. These scholars reject the idea of shorthand because they do not think it was good enough in those days to produce even such wretched stuff as the bad Quartos. They generally go further and find in the bad Quartos not so much a 'first sketch' (the term is somewhat inaccurate), as a patchwork of various styles and dates, with which Shakespeare had little to do. Opinion in Germany tends to regard them as the work of shorthand reporters using Bright's system of 'characteric.'

Digitized by Google Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Dr Price is of the German opinion and he ends his Introduction with the claim:

> Smith's sermon gives us every reason to believe that the bad Quartos are also shorthand reports. It may still be possible to argue that they are reports of the play as it was before Shakespeare took it in hand or that they are reports of Shakespeare's first sketch: that is another matter. But with Smith's sermons before us, it is not possible to say that anything in these Quartos was beyond the reach of Bright's system of characterie.

Dr Price's republication of the two texts of this sermon is a valuable contribution to the problem (a bafflingly difficult one!), but (i) it is not clear that Bright's system of shorthand was used in taking down this sermon, since the characteristic feature of that system was the use of the same symbol for synonyms and Dr Price has to confess that the 'crop of synonyms is thin and disappointing; we should have expected Bright's system to yield a much larger number'; (ii) Dr Price does not seem to realize how different the case of the sermon is from an ordinary piracy. Smith died in July, 1591, after having retired to the country for several months. The sermon was not licensed till August. There is not the smallest reason to believe that it was taken down for pecuniary gain. After Smith's death the sale of his sermons was extraordinary; during his life only two or three of them had been printed. There can be little doubt that the text was constructed by members of his congregation who equipped it with references to the texts quoted, and while they could not restore passages where the note-takers had been beaten, and passed many errors, on the whole they were very successful. Dr Price expects 'general agreement' with his statement: 'Everything points to its having been vamped up for the press by a bookseller's shark.' It seems much more likely that the bookseller secured the text of the sermon as it was being passed round among the congregation, and sent it to press as it stood.

Neither of these two points greatly affects Dr Price's main contention; he may even welcome them, for he is (and justly) quite as afraid of proving too much as of not proving enough. He recognizes that 'the sermon is better reported than the play,' and explains it by the faults of the actors; 'where the actors gave Bright's system a chance, it showed itself quite capable of reporting efficiently.' The difficulty is that, more especially in *Hamlet*, the minor parts are often so much better represented than the major ones. Since a leading actor would presumably speak his words better and be more quietly heard than a minor one, this has led to the theory of a traitorous minor actor, who knew his own parts and could perhaps supply a transcript of the text of them, but could not give help when he was off the stage, and when he was on could only listen to other actors and reproduce bits. In *Hamlet* again there is the mixture of old fashioned lines (suppressed in the good Quarto and Folio) with speeches the rhythm of which seems much later. It would be easy to mention other complexities. If it were only a question of Bright's system being good enough to account for a fairly good flat level of text, agreement with Dr Price would be easy. But the problem

Digitized by Google

Original from
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

is far too complex to admit of so simple a solution as he and the German scholars whom he mentions are ready to accept. As has been suggested, even the problem of this sermon is not so easy to solve as he appears to think. There is indeed a possibility that the pirated edition, corrected by the author's manuscript, was used in setting up the authorized text, as to the provenance of which Dr Price seems to have confused his notes. Nevertheless his double-text has to be reckoned with, and students should be grateful to him for providing it.

A. W. POLLARD.
LONDON.

Die Proparoxytona im Galloromanischen. Von EVA SEIFERT (*Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie*, LXXIV). Halle: M. Niemeyer. 1923. 8vo. xii + 148 pp. 4 M.

The author of this very comprehensive work on the proparoxytons in Gallo-Romance had already published a dissertation entitled *Zur Entwicklung der Proparoxytona auf -ite, -ita, -itu im Galloromanischen* (Berlin, 1918), and an article on *Zwei Probleme aus dem Gebiete der Proparoxytona im Galloromanischen* in the *Zeitschrift*, vol. XLII (1922), pp. 269–290. She has unfortunately been debarred by material difficulties from incorporating the contents of these earlier studies in the present volume, which to this extent is incomplete.

The author's aim is to set forth in detail the process of the reduction of the proparoxytons to oxytons or paroxytons throughout the French and Provençal areas, whether by syncope, apocope, or by shifting of stress. She distinguishes two groups of proparoxytons, those with a stop preceding the last syllable and those with a liquid or rather a continuant. With the former, syncope is the prevailing rule. It takes place in *p*-syllables (i.e. where *p* precedes the last syllable, e.g. *cannapu*) at the *b*-stage everywhere except in the central French area and in Franco-Provençal, where it takes place at the *v*-stage (*ʃãv(r)*). This is held to be proof that syncope was later in these two areas than elsewhere, but the proof is scarcely conclusive as who can say that *b* between vowels had not developed to *v* at an early date in the central French area? Cases of stress-shifting instead of syncope are found in Franco-Provençal and eastern Provençal dialects. Apocope for masculine forms, combined with stress-shifting for feminine forms, is a western Provençal feature, whereas apocope is general along the eastern border both north and south. With *t*- and *k*-syllables the grouping of the various areas is roughly similar, save that here Franco-Provençal falls in more completely with the Provençal groups. *D*-syllables, on the other hand, because of the instability of *d* between vowels, may undergo syncope or apocope with little geographical regularity. It would here appear to be rather a question of chronology and frequency of use: words introduced early and used frequently are more exposed to syncope than others. Syncope, however, is more frequent in the north, apocope in the south (cf. *tebe* and *tiède* < *tepidu*). *D*-syllables thus stand on the borderland

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

and have a treatment not unlike those of the second group, proparoxytons with a continuant before the final syllable. With this class apocope is most frequent in Provençal, syncope in French and Franco-Provençal, though in the latter area numerous cases of the complete survival of all syllables are found, accompanied by a shifting of stress to the penultimate. Shifting of stress is found also in Provençal, but here is confined in the main to feminine forms where the final vowel has survived.

Thus the only proparoxytons which normally survive in Gaul are those of the extreme south-eastern corner, that is to say in a domain belonging to the Italian speech area. French has turned them into oxytons, Provençal chiefly into paroxytons, save for certain oxytonic forms, due to sporadical stress-shifting in *l*-syllables in the central Provençal area (*tremúl* < *tremulu*) and in *k*-syllables in the Gascon dialect (*persék* < *persicu*).

The author does not discuss the proparoxyton forms of the infinitive of third conjugation verbs (*cingere*, *plangere* etc.), but her work is otherwise a very complete repertory of proparoxyton words, hypothetical as well as attested, and a valuable register of their varied destinies. She has spared no pains and appears to have consulted all available authorities. She has attempted most bravely, and with some success, to unravel the complexities of Franco-Provençal, but on the whole the variety which she here reveals tends still further to weaken one's belief in the historical reality of its survival as an independent and homogeneous speech area. It appears rather as a debatable no-man's-land between North and South.

An interesting map accompanies the volume and portrays some instructive sub-groupings between dialects which her most meritorious enquiry has brought to light.

JOHN ORR.

MANCHESTER.

P. BOISSONNADE. *Du Nouveau sur la Chanson de Roland.* Paris: H. Champion. 1923. 8°. vi + 520 pp. 25 fr.

La question de l'origine des chansons épiques dans la littérature française, après avoir fait couler beaucoup d'encre, était arrivée à recevoir une solution à peu près généralement acceptée. On admettait que l'élément historique y était infime, pour ne pas dire nul, que l'origine de ces œuvres devait se chercher autour des pèlerinages et sur les routes y conduisant, et enfin que la date de leur composition ne saurait être élevée au delà du XI^e^ siècle et plus généralement du XII^e^. M. Boissonnade admet ces conclusions et, les appliquant dans le détail à la *Chanson de Roland*, arrive à poser le problème sous un jour nouveau. Selon lui, il faut substituer au Roland historico-légendaire carolingien et à ses compagnons une série de personnages historiques du XII^e^ siècle, et la *Chanson de Roland* ne serait pas cette épopée de la France carolingienne que voulait G. Paris, mais une épopée de la Croisade, confinant au roman à clé à la manière d'*Artamène*. L'élément historique, jadis si violemment expulsé du *Roland*, y reparaîtrait, transformé il est vrai,

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

mais infiniment plus abondant que n'avaient jamais espéré le faire admettre ses anciens partisans.

Pour M. Boissonnade la *Chanson de Roland* est une œuvre composée entre 1120 et 1125 par Guillaume Turold, clerc normand originaire de l'Avranchin et fixé à Saragosse à la suite des croisés normands, et l'auteur résume ainsi ses conclusions sur la conception et les sources d'inspiration du poème: 'L'origine principale la plus importante des sources d'inspiration du poème de Turold doit être cherchée dans les événements des croisades d'Espagne et dans l'impression profonde qu'elles ont exercé sur l'esprit de toute une génération....Vivifiant par une conception originale le souvenir à demi effacé d'un mince épisode de l'histoire carolingienne, c'est en Espagne, au bruit de la lutte furieuse engagée contre l'Islam qu'il plaça le centre du conflit qui mettait aux prises à son époque la Croix avec le Croissant. En même temps lui arrivaient d'Orient les échos des victoires remportés par d'autres croisés sur les tenants de Mahomet. C'est alors que par une conception géniale le trouvère eut l'idée de tracer le tableau de cette lutte engagée par la France mandataire de Dieu contre les ennemis du Christ et que dans une puissante synthèse il groupa sur les champs de bataille de la région de l'Ebre les forces de la Chrétienté d'un côté et celles de la païenie de l'autre. Une connaissance précise du théâtre géographique de l'action de son épopée, un sens sûr et délicat des limites de son sujet, une esthétique préoccupée avant tout de l'ordre, de l'harmonie, des proportions, de la clarté, le guidèrent dans la composition de son œuvre. Le monde musulman et le monde chrétien de son temps y revivent dans leurs traits essentiels. En même temps, à l'aide des données de la légende historique et monastique vivifiée par le spectacle de la réalité contemporaine, il formait cette galerie admirable de personnages dont les principaux représentent chacun l'un des types idéalisés de la société chevaleresque, dont les autres sont les symboles de chacune des nationalités provinciales qui composaient la France. Poète épique d'une puissance incomparable...Turold avait su avec les éléments que lui offraient les légendes du passé et le tableau mouvant de la vie de son temps tirer d'un cerveau génial le premier des chefs d'œuvre de notre littérature.'

M. Boissonnade arrive à ces conclusions par une série d'études et de raisonnements que nous ne pouvons, dans les limites d'un simple compte-rendu, que résumer brièvement, trop brièvement peut-être, pour donner une juste idée de la richesse d'information de l'auteur et de l'ingéniosité de sa critique.

La première partie du livre est consacrée à un exposé des Croisades d'Espagne au XI^e^ siècle et au début du XII^e^; tableau clair, précis, souvent très neuf et qui met au point nos connaissances sur des événements jusqu'à présent presque entièrement négligés. C'est, à notre humble avis, la meilleure partie du travail de M. Boissonnade; elle vaut pour le présent et elle contient une promesse dont les érudits se réjouiront: celle de la publication par l'auteur d'une étude détaillée de l'histoire de ces expéditions. Il faut en espérer l'apparition rapide, car nous ne

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

doutons pas que l'on y trouve la preuve, que nous avons vainement cherchée, de la conclusion que tire M. Boissonnade de son exposé historique des croisades d'Espagne, c'est à savoir que celles-ci 'suscitèrent un enthousiasme presque semblable et...séduisirent presque autant les imaginations' que les croisades d'Orient.

Le second livre part de cette affirmation pour poser la thèse de l'influence de ces croisades d'Espagne sur la conception du poème de Turold, car pour M. Boissonnade Turold est l'auteur du poème dès le début de son livre. M. Boissonnade s'efforce de démontrer sa thèse en prouvant la précision géographique du poète. Pour lui, si l'on arrive à établir que le cadre géographique où se déroule l'épopée est celui où se sont déroulées les croisades d'Espagne, si l'on établit également que les connaissances géographiques du poète coïncident avec celles que pouvait avoir un contemporain de celles-ci, on aura fait faire à la thèse un progrès sensible. Mais c'est ici que les difficultés commencent. L'identification des noms de lieux dans une œuvre comme le *Roland* se heurte à ce fait que l'auteur, normand, défigure ou entend mal les vocables étrangers, et que cette première déformation est encore aggravée par les scribes qui nous ont conservé son œuvre. Cela est vrai, mais M. Boissonnade n'exagère-t-il pas un peu la seconde cause d'erreur? Si nous admettons sa thèse, l'auteur est un clerc avranchin qui écrit entre 1120 et 1125, et le manuscrit qui fait autorité pour le *Roland* est l'œuvre d'un scribe anglo-normand qui écrivait vers 1150, vingt-cinq ans ou un peu plus après la composition du poème, et qui parlait par conséquent la même langue que Turold. M. Boissonnade examine donc successivement les différents noms de lieux et de peuples que l'on trouve dans le poème et les identifie dans les différents pays où la Croisade s'est développée au XII^e^ siècle. Bien entendu le morceau essentiel de la démonstration est celui qui intéresse l'Espagne du Nord. Tout en rendant justice aux efforts de M. Boissonnade on ne peut s'empêcher de craindre que certaines de ses identifications ne soient pour le moins discutables, par exemple: *Durestant* = Daroca-Durera; *Haltilie* = Peraltillia; *Sebilie* = Sedilès ou Castrum Situli. M. Boissonnade le sent bien lui-même et on le voit à plusieurs reprises proposer des corrections au manuscrit d'Oxford, ce qui nous semble bien un aveu d'impuissance. Et puis il reste l'insurmontable difficulté du vers 6: *Fors sarraguce ki est en une muntaigne*; vers bien invraisemblable sous la plume d'un poète vivant à Saragosse et qui aurait certainement connu la situation de la ville dans la plaine de l'Ebre. Il aurait également su que la ville est au bord du fleuve et non pas assez loin de celui-ci comme le laissent clairement entendre les vers 2673, 2689, 2818, 2841. M. Boissonnade s'efforce de résoudre ces difficultés, la première par l'exemple de la Montagne de Reims et la présence d'une colline près de Saragosse. S'il nous avait cité un poète écrivant (et faisant un vers faux) *Fors Reins ki est en une muntaigne*, cela vaudrait mieux. Il en est d'ailleurs réduit à nous proposer la correction de *en* en *suz* dans le manuscrit. Et d'ailleurs, si l'on acceptait cette correction, il resterait la question du voisinage du fleuve dont la solution proposée par M. Bois-

Digitized by Google Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

sonnade ne satisfera pas, je le crains, ses lecteurs. Il ne nous est pas possible de suivre le savant auteur dans le détail de ses identifications orientales ou européennes dont beaucoup pour intéressantes qu'elles soient, ne nous paraissent nullement certaines. Pour ne citer qu'un exemple M. Boissonnade rencontre le vers célèbre où Gautier de l'Hum se fait reconnaître de Roland en lui rappelant que c'est lui, Gautier, *ki cunquist Maëlgut*, et propose pour l'identification de Maëlgut, les localités de Malgrat, de Malgrat de Noves, et surtout de Monteagudo-Montagut (pp. 123–125), celle-ci avec une correction au manuscrit. Il y avait pourtant une autre identification qui, nous semble-t-il, s'imposait. Le Maëlgut 'conquis' par Gautier de l'Hum ne serait-il pas plutôt Maïlgwn (prononcer Maelgoun), *Maglocunus*, l'*insularis draco* insulté dans son *De Excidio Britanniae* par le sage Gildas si populaire dans l'hagiographie bretonne? Il faudra donc accepter sous réserve le résumé dans lequel M. Boissonnade déclare avoir identifié dans une proportion des neuf dixièmes les noms de lieux et de peuples de la chanson de Roland. Il ajoute ensuite, tirant la conclusion de son enquête de toponomastique: La mention de ces différents noms 'est la preuve indéniable de l'impression profonde que le poète a ressentie au beau spectacle du monde chrétien en lutte pour le triomphe de la Croix contre le monde des infidèles qu'il confond sous le terme générique de païens. Que ce soit sur le sol de l'Espagne, sur celui du Maghreb ou de la Sicile, etc.... partout son imagination a été frappée à la vue de tant d'entreprises, de tant d'exploits, dûs au génie aventureux et magnanime de notre race qui est la sienne. Il en a éprouvé la fierté....Qu'il ait connu le théâtre de leurs luttes, soit par lui-même comme il semble bien qu'il ait pu le faire en Espagne, soit par les récits des témoins oculaires, des acteurs et des narrateurs de ces grandes expéditions comme celles du Nord et de l'Orient, qu'il ne lui en soit parvenu parfois qu'un écho lointain et déformé, il importe peu. Une idée essentielle se dégage de cette enquête...l'idée de l'inspiration qui a déterminé la genèse de la Chanson de Roland, et cette inspiration est celle des grands événements des guerres saintes d'où devait surgir sans effort le souffle puissant de l'épopée. La conception vraiment épique qui apparaît dans le chef-d'œuvre de Turold est donc née, non d'une légende ancienne perdue dans le recul de trois siècles, réduite à quelques traits à demi-périmés, mais bien du spectacle de la croisade universelle....

'Ce n'est donc pas un vain étalage d'érudition incohérente, un vain cliquetis de vocables sonores que le poète recherche....Ce n'est plus un des épisodes des Croisades qu'il met ainsi en scène, c'est la *croisade* toute entière qu'il résume, qu'il concentre dans les plaines de l'Ebre où s'accomplit l'œuvre du Christ par l'épée des Francs.'

Cette conclusion, d'une belle envolée d'ailleurs, surprend un peu. N'est-ce pas tirer beaucoup d'une série d'identifications, ingénieuses sans doute, mais discutables? Le malheur est que M. Boissonnade la tient pour établie et qu'il part d'elle, comme on va le voir, pour écrire son troisième livre qui est, nous regrettons de le dire, le moins satisfaisant de tous.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

L'auteur y examine comment le monde féodale du XII^e^ siècle, musulman et chrétien, se retrouve dans la *Chanson de Roland.* L'auteur connaît admirablement le XII^e^ siècle mais il a, je le crains, une tendance à préciser trop l'apparition de certaines habitudes ou de certains détails de l'armement, en outre il voit dans certains traits des caractéristiques du XII^e^ siècle quand ils sont des caractéristiques de l'époque féodale dans son sens le plus large. Tout ceci d'ailleurs serait sans importance si M. Boissonnade s'était borné à reconnaître dans le *Roland* une peinture exacte du XII^e^ siècle. Mais il a voulu pousser sa thèse jusqu'aux dernières limites et retrouver dans les héros du poème des personnages contemporains. De cette façon Charlemagne est Charlemagne mais est aussi Guilhen d'Aquitaine, Roland est Roland mais aussi Gaston de Béarn et Rotrou du Perche, Turpin est l'archevêque carolingien de Reims et aussi son lointain successeur Manassès I^er^, contemporain de Philippe I^er^, et ainsi de suite. Tous les personnages y passent et fournissent à M. Boissonnade l'occasion de faire preuve d'une connaissance remarquable de la France féodale au XII^e^ siècle, connaissance que l'on regrette de voir employée à une œuvre aussi vaine.

La dernière partie du livre III tend à montrer chez l'auteur du poème une connaissance particulière du monde féodal normand de son époque et sert en quelque sorte d'introduction à la dernière partie du livre de M. Boissonnade, celle qui traite de la date, la patrie et l'auteur du poème. Sur la date, la démonstration de M. Boissonnade se compose de deux éléments: la détermination du *terminus ad quem* qu'il fixe en 1125, et qui ne soulèvera aucune difficulté, celle du *terminus a quo*, qui au contraire appelle des réserves sérieuses. M. Boissonnade écarte à notre avis un peu facilement le témoignage de Wace contre lequel le silence de Guillaume de Jumièges, de Guillaume de Poitiers et de Henri de Huntingdon ne vaut que relativement. En outre quand il en vient a discuter les dates, M. Boissonnade se sert de faits qui n'ont rien de prouvé. Pour lui par exemple les villes de Cortès et de Monubles ayant été prises entre 1114 et 1118, le *Roland* doit être postérieur à ces événements parceque ces villes nous sont données dans le poème comme ayant été conquises l'une par Roland, l'autre par Charlemagne. Seulement, dans le texte du poème, Roland se vante d'avoir conquis *Commibles*, et Charlemagne nous est donné comme ayant pris *Cordres*. M. Boissonnade ayant identifié *Commibles* avec Monubles et *Cordres* avec Cortès son raisonnement se comprend, mais il ne vaut que si les identifications sont admises, et nous craignons qu'elles ne le soient pas. De même la prise de Saragosse par les Chrétiens se place entre 1114 et 1118, le poète a une connaissance précise de cette ville (quoiqu'il la place sur une montagne!) donc le poème est postérieur à cet événement. La prise de Daroca-Durera fut une conséquence de la bataille de Catanda en 1120. Nous trouvons dans le poème Durestant comme le limite du royaume de Marsile. M. Boissonnade a identifié Durestant et Daroca-Durera. Donc le poème est écrit au plus tôt en 1120. On voit le procédé; il serait justifié, et encore, si les identifications proposées étaient admises, les résultats qu'il produira vaudront ce que vaudront

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

les identifications. Sur le nom de l'auteur M. Boissonnade n'a pas de doute et pour lui le mot *declinet* ne présente pas de difficultés. Turold est l'auteur du poème. M. Boissonnade commence son enquête sur lui et conclut qu'il est clerc mais non moine, qu'il a une culture classique, qu'il a traversé les cours seigneuriales, qu'il est normand et normand du pays d'Avranches. M. Boissonnade n'a plus qu'à trouver un clerc normand, avranchin même, nommé Turold, ayant séjourné en Espagne, familier du prototype de Roland, Rotrou du Perche. Il le découvre en la personne de Guillaume Turold.

Tout cela est ingénieux, trop ingénieux même, et cette ingéniosité même révèle la faiblesse de la thèse de l'auteur. Quand bien même toutes les identifications proposées seraient acceptables et acceptées, il ne s'en suivrait nullement que la croisade d'Espagne a été la source d'inspiration du poème; et en admettant même ces deux premiers éléments du raisonnement, il ne serait nullement certain que les personnages étudiés par M. Boissonnade aient servi de modèles à l'auteur ni que ce dernier soit Guillaume Turold.

Nous sommes donc amenés à conclure que M. Boissonnade a échoué dans l'œuvre qu'il avait entreprise. Les origines du *Roland* restent pour nous obscures. Mais il faut ajouter pour être juste qu'il sera nécessaire d'avoir le livre de M. Boissonnade pour lire le *Roland*—et à ce propos qu'il est bien fâcheux que ce livre soit dépourvu d'index. M. Boissonnade apporte une masse considérable de faits, certains établis solidement, d'autres qui le sont moins. Son livre, extrêmement dangereux dans des mains inexpérimentées, sera au contraire pour un travailleur exercé un outil de premier ordre et nous ne doutons pas que ce livre, dont nous regrettons de ne pouvoir accepter les conclusions, ne contribue, par les suggestions qu'il contient et les recherches qu'il rend accessibles, à nous permettre d'avoir un jour la solution de ce problème capital et encore obscur de l'origine de nos épopées nationales.

MANCHESTER. R. FAWTIER.

Le Liure de la Deablerie of Eloy d'Amerval. Edited by CHARLES FREDERICK WARD. (*University of Iowa Studies, Humanistic Studies*, Vol. II, No. 2.) Iowa: University Press. xxiii + 259 pp. $8.

This is an imposing volume, printed in special black-letter type, and comprising an introduction, a reproduction of the frontispiece of the original 1508 edition, 247 double pages of text, and ten pages of index and textual apparatus—well over 500 pages in all. We should have preferred to the luxury of black-letter gothic, which soon tires the eye, a more adequate introduction, a more competently edited text, and a real index.

The weaknesses of this edition are not due to any under-estimation on the editor's part of his author's greatness, for he can 'hardly refrain' from calling the *Deablerie* a masterpiece, excelling all contemporaneous satire (of which the editor gives a somewhat perfunctory account) and 'essentially original in its linking up of human problems with the in-

Digitized by Google Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

visible world, in its encyclopaedic range, in its constructive criticism, in its extraordinary idealism.' We cannot subscribe to this estimate. The *Deablerie* is fundamentally a mediaeval work, closely linked in form, matter and outlook with the *Bibles*, the *Estats du Monde* of mediaeval satirists. The forerunners of Eloy d'Amerval are Etienne de Fougères, Guyot de Provins, Hugue de Berzé, and Jean de Meung. The *Deablerie*, though standing on the threshold of the sixteenth century, is an end rather than a beginning, and has nothing of the spirit of works like the *Cymbalum* of Des Periers from which it is separated by only thirty years.

We would not deny talent to its author. There is many a page of brisk and racy dialogue between the protagonists, Lucifer and Satan, to remind us that Eloy, high-minded cleric though he be, is the compatriot of the Picard fabliaux poets. But his exclusive use of dialogue, though it enlivens his lengthy pages and makes them still readable, is none the less a source of weakness. For he would fain persuade as well as convict, and is thus continually embarrassed by the necessity for putting in the mouths of Satan and Lucifer moral precepts entirely foreign to their character. The undoubted literary worth of this mediaeval survival is, however, of relatively small account compared with its documentary value as a comprehensive description of contemporary French society, its customs and manners, its food and its dress, its work and its play, and that is our chief reason for regretting the deficiencies of the present edition both as regards text and index.

The latter, though it purports to be an 'Index nominum et rerum,' is, first of all, sadly inadequate. It contains some eighty items, all told, for over 20,000 lines of text. As a typical omission I would mention the fact that of a valuable list of twenty names of mediaeval composers enumerated by Eloy, a musician himself, only one appears in the index, that of John of Dunstable, so called, the editor informs us, from the town in Scotland where he was born! Moreover it is difficult to understand on what principle the index is composed. It contains suggested emendations, verbal explanations often of a most elementary kind, and unaccountable entries like the word *Broquart* which, in the form 'brocard,' is familiar to every reader of modern French, or *Haro*, which is in every French dictionary. Worst of all, chiefly owing to the fact that the editor has misunderstood the text, the index is in several places misleading. I have noted the following errors:

Emplumé, p. 99 L, l. 7, means simply 'stuffed with down' and is not 'sarcastic.'

Folabesti, p. 17 L, is not an epithet 'probably coined by the author'; it should be read as two words: 'fou abêti.'

Seclin, in the expression *loquebaut de Seclin*, is a place-name; it should be printed with a capital.

Seigneur de Robesac, p. 157 R, is not 'cited as a model of probity' but, as the text clearly shows, is a fanciful name for an extortioner.

Rogier Bontemps, twice mentioned, is a traditional character and has no connexion with Roger de Collerye.

Molsobesti, p. 17 L, is not a 'probably meaningless epithet' but, as

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

the author takes great pains to explain, is composed of three sins 'contre nature.' *Mol-* is the first syllable of *molice*, *-so-* of *sodomie*, and *-besti* of some compound of *bestia*.

Badrée, p. 102 R, is not 'a Picard form of Andrée,' but the name of 'une autre manière de tarte, et se fait de beau lait bouilli.'

Cordiers, p. 119 L, are not 'Franciscan friars' but 'sellers of rope.'

Notrées, in the expression *en dire de bien notrées*, which occurs p. 40 R and elsewhere, would not appear to be for *notées* as the editor suggests, but for *otrées*, 'outrées.'

Torfou in the expression *è torfou* is scarcely 'a pun on *torfait*,' but is more likely to mean 'in a crack of a whip,' i.e. 'in a trice.'

Let us now turn to a more lengthy but more fruitful task, the discussion of the text. The editor does not publish a diplomatic reproduction of the 1508 edition; he offers us a critical text, modernised in punctuation, in and by the use of accents, capitals, hyphens, the apostrophe and the cedilla. He corrects 'obvious errors,' makes some emendations and suggests others. We have thus full liberty to criticise both from the point of view of omission and commission. For convenience sake I shall first of all examine the corrections of 'obvious errors' contained in the appendix. In the majority of cases they are quite legitimate rectifications of typographical mistakes, in others, however, as the following list will show, they are unwarranted and even pernicious tamperings with the text:

P. 35 L, l. 43: *qui* is for *qu'i*, not *qu'il*.

P. 43 L, l. 1: *tu veux qu'elle ten file*, 'that she should weave you some,' is corrected to *qu'elle te ne file*, which not only does not make sense, but spoils the metre.

P. 97 L, l. 17: *fasee*, an interesting derivative of *face*, is changed to *fafée*, and gives another meaningless line.

P. 107 L, l. 10: the change of *tel chose* (cf. the modern *grand'chose*) to *telle chose* ruins the metre and destroys an interesting survival of the early invariability of *tel* in the feminine.

P. 166 R, l. 2: the line *Laisse le moustier ou il est*, which occurs again p. 188, is a proverbial expression meaning 'don't try to shift the church'; by changing *moustier* to *monstrer* the editor shows, to say the least, a decided lack of acumen.

P. 170 R, l. 2: the text has *saillie hors*, obviously wrong, as it gives no meaning and makes the line too long. Instead of correcting to *saillir hors*, which satisfies all requirements, the editor prints *sailli' hors*, which leaves the meaning no clearer and introduces an impossible elision of an *e* before an aspirate.

P. 201 L, l. 39: after an enumeration of districts occur the words *et d'autres leux*; the editor, not recognising this dialect form of *lieux*, changes to *et d'autres d'eux*, which is as bad sense as it is bad grammar.

P. 205 R, l. 36: the Picard form *tersaillir* is changed to *tresaillir*.

It is thus with some misgivings as to the adequacy of the editor's scholarship that we turn to the text, misgivings which, I fear, are but too well grounded. I append a list of corrections and emendations which,

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

though necessarily incomplete, may be of some service as a contribution towards a more accurate version of this important work.

P. 14 R, *ligne*, r. *ligue*. P. 17 L, *folabesti*, r. *fol abesti*; cf. also p. 27 R. P. 18 R, *dire*, r. *d'ire*. P. 19 R, punctuate: *Depuis? Ce n'est rien de ton fait*. P. 20 L, punctuate: *Après? T'es-tu...?*, and lower down: *Et quoi?* P. 22 R, *ton bejaune*, r. *ton bec jaune;* ib., *Qu'il lui bailla*, r. *Qui lui*. P. 27 L, *Car il est voie et verité...et voye aussi*, r. *et vie aussi*: 'the Way, the Truth and the Life.' P. 27 R, r. *le* [*plus*] *beau fait;* ib., *Se ne fut pas ung tel folatre*: this has no apparent meaning as punctuated; it should be taken with the preceding line, *scil.* 'I am in great doubt as to whether it was not some person or other (*ung tel*) of evil intent.' P. 28 R, r. *je fut donc* [*i*] *celluy baveux*. P. 29 L, *seminani*, r. *seminavi*. P. 31 R, *lignes*, r. *ligues*. P. 35 L, *sans qui s'en fust*, r. *sans qu'i s'en fust*; the line still remains too short. P. 37 R, r. *Seclin*. P. 41 L, *Quant ilz ont*, r. *Quant ilz l'oient* (audiunt); ib. *tu croyes*, r. *tu cryes*. P. 41 R, *bourdera*, *? boudera*. P. 43 R, r. *qu'elle t'en file*; ib., *chafoum*, r. *chafouin*; ib., *à garder*, r. *et g*. P. 44 L, *Puis s'en retournast sans jour A sa quenouille tout ce sejour*; interchange the end words of both lines and you satisfy sense and metre. P. 44 R, r. *La dame de tout bien parée*; ib., place *?* after *filace* and not after *grace*; *ayme* = 'qu'elle aime.' P. 46 R, *Et puisqu'en esse, en suys-je pire ne Toy?*, r. *Et puis, qu'en esse* (*est-ce*)*? En suys-je* etc. P. 48 R, *passe mille ans*, r. *passé*; ib., *m'esprendre*, r. *mesprendre* ('do evil'). P. 50 L, *emmy escombatre*, r. *ennuy esc*. P. 54 R, *A toute la seinte escripture* goes with the following line. P. 55 L, *Mais gentils galans*, r. *mes*, cf. 55 R, l. 1. P. 55 R, full stop after *trouueront*; comma after *noël*; ib., *emprimer*, *? emprunter*. P. 59 L, del. *!* after *desavouer*. P. 60 L, *quart*, r. *quarte*. P. 61 R, *tezis*, *depletz*, r. *repletz*. P. 64 L, *chascun prendra par son iaret*, r. *pendra, jaret*: allusion to the well known proverb 'each goat hangs by its own leg.' P. 64 R, *Rolette*, *? Polette*. P. 72 L, (*Tout corvant c'est un grand tresor*): as printed this line is to me meaningless. It will make sense if *tout corvant* is taken with *haren sor* of the preceding line, 'a red herring all out of shape'; the first bracket should thus be after *corvant*; ib., *du gros pain noir et chausy*, r. *chansy* = chanci, 'mouldy.' P. 73 L, *panisti*, r. *pavisti*. P. 77 R, *aux bons* is dependent on *ne desplaise*, the comma after *bons* makes nonsense. P. 79 L, *teste linolle*; what is *linolle?* On p. 174 L the editor prints *testelivolle*, as one word; it is probably a compound *teste-li-vole* in both cases, meaning 'light-head,' but if *linolle* is the proper reading, it is for *lignole* (*n* for *gn* is frequent throughout), 'piece of string,' and *teste* is from the verb *téter* with a superfluous *s*; one thinks immediately of the modern *tête de linotte*, but there would appear to be no reason for introducing it here. P. 80 L, r. *songe-malice*, a compound of verb plus noun. P. 82 R, r. *note* [*ce*] *mot*. P. 86 L, *en latre*, r. *en l'atre*; ib., remove note of exclamation after *forte fiebure* to end of following line. P. 87 L, *Autant comme du non au per*; one suspects here *autant que du nonper au per* which, with the preceding line, means 'there is as much difference as between odd and even.' P. 88 L, *sorseries*, r. *farseries*. P. 89 R, *fignientum*, r. *figmentum*. P. 91 L, *illud*, r. *illuc*. P. 92 L, *maint a à vivre*, r. *mains* (moins). P. 93 R, 94 L:

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Ne vallent pas deux quoques d'oeufz,
C'est à dire en temps de charnage
Et de karesme. Que dirai-je
D'eulx vieux et tous puans sorez ?

To make this intelligible punctuate as follows: semi-colon after *charnage*; omit stop after *karesme*; place *?* after *je*; read *deux* for *d'eulx*; and put full stop after *sorez*. It then means 'They are not worth two egg-shells, that is to say in the meat season; and what shall I say of the lenten season?—two rotten old red herrings.' P. 93 L, *la layne et le poulx*, r. *l'alayne et le poulx* (l'haleine). P. 106 L, *saultant d'enfant*, r. *saultant, dansant*. P. 107 L, *demisailles*, r. *de misailles*, 'stake, forfeit.' P. 110 L, *Comme ilz se muient huy en lyesse Ilz metineront en tristesse*, r. *sement, mestiveront*, 'sow, reap,' cf. p. 158 R. P. 110 R, r. *La pollice* [*est*]. P. 123 L, *Ilz luy dirent*, r. *diront*. P. 128 R, *reptiquer*, r. *repliquer*. P. 132 R, *si attendoit*, r. *s'i attendoit*. P. 136 R, *emmy, escombatre*, r. *ennuy esc*. P. 138 R, *d'une crime*, r. *d'un crime*, as the metre requires. P. 139 L, *Qui n'en ait assez d'une maiz*, r. *d'une* (scil. *cure*). *Mais*.... P. 147 L, *m'en yvre*, r. *m'enyvre*. P. 148 L, *ahaueroit*, r. *ahaneroit*. P. 152 R, *dacule*, r. *bacule*, 'beat.' P. 154 R, *qu'i peut*, r. *qui peut*. P. 155 R, remove note of interrogation after *tirera*: 'It's true (that the horse pulls well) but what he pulls he'll never shift!' P. 157 L, *De s'y tuer ? Sy c'est en tache*; r. *de s'y tuer sy c'est en tache*: 'to kill himself (by working hard) if it is paid by the piece.' P. 158 L, *biberons, ? vinerons* (vignerons). P. 159 R, *bras*, r. *dras*. P. 161 L, *rime*, r. *rive*. P. 166 R, *il sa beau taire*, r. *il s'a beau taire* (il a beau se taire). P. 169 R, remove *!* and bracket after *casser* and place after *batons*. P. 170 R, *font du gros bis*, r. *font du grobis*, 'put on airs,' cf. p. 137 L. P. 172 R, *L'autre y reçout ses vieux souliers*; why the cedilla? The verb is *recoudre*, not *recevoir*. P. 173 L, full stop after *besongnant*; ib., *Et auquel il sert asservy*, r. *sera*; ib., omit full stop after *nommé*. P. 180 L, *Plus souvent que chat ne le mouche*, r. *se mouche*. P. 183 L, *voice*, r. *voire*. P. 188 R, full stop after *merveilles*; *je t'en dy tant* is a parenthesis. The remainder of this passage is obscure as punctuated, and the line that begins *Postreme* (t. *postreue*) is too long. P. 195 R, *subcouuee*, r. *subçonnée*, 'soupçonnée.' P. 196 L, *sufretés*, r. *soufretes*, 'need, want.' P. 196 R, *Par sufreté et menditité*, r. *Par sufrete et mendicité* (or *mendieté*). P. 198 R, *le corron de Luys*, r. *le cordon* (?) *de l'uis* (huis, 'door'). P. 199 R, *et huille*, r. *en huille*. P. 201 R, *que bien bataille*, r. *qui b. b.*, the *qui* for *que* in the following line explains the error. P. 206 R, *digne*, r. *digné*, 'dîné.' P. 208 R, *princes iniquites*, r. *iniques*. P. 209 R, *seclin*, r. *Seclin*. P. 210 L, *des prestre*, r. *prestres*. P. 215 R, *forvoysons*, r. *forvoyons*, 'stray,' the *s* is due to an anticipation of *seduysons* in the next line. P. 218 L, *encliné*, r. *encline* (fem.). P. 219 R, comma after *dire trois* and after *sambloit*. P. 225 R, *fruction*, r. *fruition* (4 syll.). P. 228 R, full stop after *ydolle*; *que*, in the next line, goes with *fût-il* (not *fut-il*), 'would that he were!' P. 247 L, r. *car on* [*y*] *voit*.

JOHN ORR.

MANCHESTER.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

The Poems of Leopardi. Edited with Introduction and Notes and a Verse Translation in the Metres of the Original by GEOFFREY L. BICKERSTETH. Cambridge: University Press. 1923. xii + 544 pp. 8vo. 30*s.*

The late Lord Bryce—following no doubt the Gladstonian tradition—once remarked to the present reviewer that the first duty of a professor of Italian Studies was to teach his students to appreciate Leopardi. There is probably no other Italian poet, after Dante, whose name at present stands so high; he and Manzoni are recognised as the two supremely great figures in the literature of Italy during the nineteenth century, with Carducci as their successor. Mr Bickersteth, who has already published a meritorious volume on Carducci, now—on a far larger scale and with more matured scholarship—gives us an edition of the *Canti* with a translation that aims at 'faithfulness not only to the content, but also to the form,' accompanied by introductory essays on the poet's life, thought, and art, a full commentary and an extensive bibliography. It is no disparagement to his edition when we say that the introduction is the most valuable part of the work. After the labours of Mestica and others, there is naturally little or nothing for a foreigner to do with respect to the text. But the poet is one who calls for interpretation, from the aesthetic and the philosophical standpoint alike: 'Il Leopardi,' wrote Carducci, 'ha bisogno di commento; è un autore su la cui chiarezza non si vuol far troppo a fidanza.' Mr Bickersteth's essays on the 'Poet's Art' and the 'Poet's Thought,' documented from the *Zibaldone* and the prose works, are searching and illuminating; no one, however well he may know these poems, can rise from the study of this English scholar's pages without finding his own view of Leopardi widened and clarified.

The attempt to regard the *Canti* as 'a single coherent work of art' is perhaps pressed a little too far, but it is interesting and suggestive. In the peculiarly difficult task of reproducing the metres of the original, Mr Bickersteth's translation is as successful as could fairly be expected, and the departure which he defends, the insertion occasionally of extra rhymes, justifies itself. It is usually sufficiently close, dignified, and frequently musical. We have noticed a very few unfortunate passages (for instance, *La Ginestra*, 271–273, lines of which there has been some recent discussion as to the precise meaning), but these are exceptional. Among the Appendices, a note on the structure of the Canzone seems rather confused, the writer drawing his conception of the 'canzone distesa' of the early poets somewhat too exclusively from the rules laid down in the *De Vulgari Eloquentia*. Dante's 'sine responsorio,' which Mr Bickersteth renders 'without choral interludes,' simply means without the *ripresa* or refrain of the 'canzone a ballo' or ballata. We are mystified by a footnote about the metrical principles of Petrarch (p. 509); the innovation here attributed to him had (except of course in the case of the two types of canzone with undivided stanzas) become the almost universal rule before the end of the thirteenth century. To the excellent bibliography might perhaps have been added the essay

Digitized by Google Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

of Ugo Scoti-Bertinelli, *L' unità estetica della lirica leopardiana* (in the *Giornale storico della letteratura italiana*, LXVIII, 1916).

There is so little to relieve the tragedy of Leopardi's life-story that we are tempted to wish that Mr Bickersteth had admitted a lighter note where possible. In justice to that much criticised person, Count Monaldo, we miss his own really pleasing defence of his action in preventing the reprinting of the two patriotic canzoni, the letter of July 14, 1828, with the pathetic sentence: 'Se non potete applaudire all' ingegno del vostro padre, almeno farete ragione al mio amorosissimo cuore.' Also, though we agree that Leopardi is no fit subject for merriment, was it necessary so austerely to ignore the slightly humorous aspect of his relations with Fanny Tozzetti-Targioni, the hunt for autographs for her collection and the like? And surely the question she put to Ranieri about *Aspasia* (p. 471) was more subtle—and more cynical—than simply whether 'Aspasia was intended to represent herself.'

Apart from its intrinsic value, Mr Bickersteth's work marks what we trust will be a most welcome and significant development of Italian studies in England. For the first time an English scholar has produced an edition of a modern Italian poet with that fulness of detail and minute critical analysis which hitherto in this country has been reserved for Dante.

LONDON. EDMUND G. GARDNER.

The Book of the Lover and the Beloved. Translated from the Catalan of RAMÓN LULL with an introductory essay by E. ALLISON PEERS. London: Soc. for Prom. Christian Knowledge. 1923. 8vo. viii. + 106 pp. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Ramón Lull, the Majorcan 'Apostle of Africa,' is a name that has been unaccountably ignored by recent writers on mysticism, and English readers will be grateful to Professor Allison Peers for his rendering of the *Libre de Amich e Amat.* It is mysticism that reminds us now of St Bernard or the Victorines, now of St Francis or of Lull's own contemporary, Jacopone da Todi, but with a purely individual tone throughout; an authentic document of the 'science of love.' These three hundred and sixty-six 'verses,' one for each day of the year, have frequently a rare spiritual beauty and poignant simplicity:

Love put joys and trials together into the Lover's thoughts, and the joys made complaint of that company and accused Love before the Beloved. But when He had parted them from the sorrows which Love gives to his lovers, behold, they vanished and were gone (226).

'Say, O Fool, what is love?' He answered: 'Love is that which throws the free into bondage, and to those that are in bonds gives liberty.' And who can say whether in love there is more of liberty or of bondage? (284).

The birds hymned the dawn, and the Beloved, who is the dawn, awakened. And the birds ended their song, and the Lover died in the dawn for his Beloved (25).

There are other bird passages, no less beautiful (15, 26, 58). To the student of mediaeval philosophy Lull's verses often have a peculiar interest as they give a mystical colour to questions at issue among the

Digitized by Google Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

schoolmen. Does *beatitudo* consist in an act of the will or an act of the understanding? Thus Aquinas (*S. T.* I, ii, q. 3, a. 4, ad 4): 'Dilectio praeeminet cognitioni in movendo; sed cognitio praevia est dilectioni in attingendo.' And Dante (*Par.* XXVIII, 109–111):

> Quinci si può veder come si fonda
> l' esser beato ne l' atto che vede,
> non in quel ch' ama, che poscia seconda.

Lull's solution is practically the same, though its expression is his own:

> The Lover asked the Understanding and the Will which of them was the nearer to his Beloved. And the two ran, and the Understanding came nearer to the Beloved than did the Will (18).

Frequently does Lull emphasise the interaction of the three powers of the soul in the ascent 'to the contemplation of the Beloved's glories' (220, 122, 178); a favourite theme with the mystics which was to find, perhaps, its most perfect expression in certain letters of St Catherine of Siena. We remember the answer which, according to St Augustine, was given 'joculariter' to one who asked what God was doing before He made heaven and earth: 'Alta scrutantibus gehennas parabat' (*Conf.* xi, 12). Lull, not 'eludens quaestionis violentiam,' has his own reply:

> 'Say, O Fool, what did thy Beloved before the world was?' He answered: 'My Beloved loved, because of His manifold properties, eternal, personal, and infinite, in which are Lover, Love, and Beloved' (252).

Elsewhere (274) there seem echoes of those Averroist disputations at the university of Paris, where Lull himself was a strenuous defender of the orthodox cause. Again, though it is not necessary to suppose that he knew anything of Guido Guinizelli, one of his verses suggests the famous canzone, *Al cor gentil ripara sempre Amore*, and the sonnet that Dante was afterwards to base upon it (*Amore e 'l cor gentil sono una cosa*):

> 'Say, Fool, which was in being first, thy heart or thy love?' He answered and said: 'Both came into being together; for were it not so, the heart had not been made for love, nor love for reflection' (74)[1].

The strange spiritual romance, *Blanquerna*, of which this *Book of the Lover and the Beloved* forms part, is believed to have been written in 1283, the year in which the first sonnet of the *Vita Nuova* was composed. It was about a month after Dante had written his letter to a friend in Florence refusing to avail himself of the amnesty, when the crowd on June 30, 1315, stoned Ramón Lull to death outside the city of Bugia. 'The Beloved said to His Lover: "Thou shalt praise and defend Me in places where men fear to praise Me." The Lover answered: "Provide me then with love." The Beloved answered: "For love of thee I became incarnate, and endured the pains of death"' (130). There is hardly a passage in this little book that does not invite quotation or suggest comparison with other gems of mystical literature. The

[1] Cf. also § 259 with the sentence in the *De Vulgari Eloquentia* (II, 5) about the even being subject to the odd numbers 'quemadmodum materia formae.'

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

introductory essay is excellent, and we trust that Professor Allison Peers will soon fulfil his promise of following it up with other translations from Lull's work.

EDMUND G. GARDNER.

LONDON.

Spanish Drama before Lope de Vega. By J. P. WICKERSHAM CRAWFORD. (*Publications of the University of Pennsylvania. Extra Series in Romanic Languages and Literatures*, No. VII.) Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania. 1922. 198 pp.

The attraction of sixteenth-century drama for American Hispanists has been for years so evident that this work may be regarded as in a measure the pronouncement of a 'School'; and the impression is confirmed by frequent citations from Messrs Rennert, Scheville, Northup, Espinosa, House, Gillet and others, as well as references to the *Romanic Review*. To the information presented by von Schack's *Geschichte der dramatischen Literatur und Kunst in Spanien*, the writer adds the fruit of his own researches and those of his American and Spanish compeers; while his book stands beside Professor Rennert's *Life of Lope de Vega* as a valuable contribution to a revised history of Spanish dramaturgy.

In criticism Dr Crawford is a formalist. He limits his view to works which are externally marked as dramatic, and to the Castilian tongue, paying little attention to the Catalan or Valencian, and as little as possible to Portuguese. He is more concerned, too, with the books in front of him than with endeavouring to shed light on post-Lopean developments; and indeed, for the all-important question of Lope de Vega's indebtedness to his antecedents, he is content with a few lines and a bibliographical note. Generalisations are infrequent and somewhat timid; and we doubt whether the reader will rest satisfied with the treatment of such topics as the defeat of the Senecans, the dramatic qualities of ballads and ballad-sequences and of the Castilian form of pastoral lyrics, of the dramatico-epic poem of Juan Ruiz and the Celestina-tradition, of the creation and existence of many accepted types of character, or of the intense regional vigour of the pullulating *Comedia*. To those who enquire what dramatic possibilities, as distinct from accomplishments, the sixteenth century presented to the writers of the period of mature art, this book is an incomplete reply. The writer is inclined to avoid comprehensive judgments upon authors; and tends to consider individual works, as it were, photographically, trusting, we think unduly, to the recital of strings of plots. The chapters and paragraphs are arranged according to the content of individual plays, with acknowledgment of chronology—an arrangement which follows naturally from the tendencies of Professor Crawford's previous studies. Fortunately no personality, other than that of Gil Vicente (who is already handicapped by the ruling against his Portuguese works), is sufficiently complex and varied to suffer from the method; to the other authors substantial justice is done. The qualities of this work are, however, its foundation in sincere study and personal research; the store of fresh

Digitized by Google

Original from
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

material, new or newly combined; the correction of previous errors and conjectures; the sobriety and definiteness of the exposition, and the rejection of all irrelevance. The bibliography is full and accompanied by judicious notes; the analyses of plays and books satisfying; the indication of sources, as is to be expected from American scholarship, clear and continuous, and the execution equal and balanced. The older history excels in breadth of treatment, literary experience, and illuminating criticism; but for detail, modernity and precision the student will turn to Professor Crawford's admirable study.

W. J. Entwistle.
Manchester.

Friedrich Hölderlin and the German Neo-Hellenic Movement. Part I. *From the Renaissance to the Thalia-Fragment of Hölderlin's 'Hyperion.'* By Marshall Montgomery. London: Oxford University Press. 8vo. viii + 232 pp. 10*s.* 6*d.*

In this volume the Taylorian Lecturer in German at Oxford has produced a monograph which, in value and interest, is inferior to nothing that has been produced on a German theme in recent years in England or America. Mr Montgomery's wide scholarship, however, is but imperfectly indicated by his title. There are many potential readers who, having little interest in Hölderlin, will lay the volume aside unopened; whereas, if they knew that it contained a very admirable account of the general Neo-Hellenic movement of the eighteenth century, they would read it with avidity. Had, indeed, Mr Montgomery turned his title round, it might have better described what he has given us; for, on a rough estimate, five-eighths of his book deal with the general Neo-Hellenic movement and only three-eighths with Hölderlin. One gets the impression that the work has grown under its author's hands, and developed into a larger investigation than was originally planned. It is a book on Hölderlin embedded in a comprehensive study of the movement to which he belonged; and the framework—as far as this first part is concerned, at least—has dwarfed the picture. It is easy to understand how Mr Montgomery was tempted to elaborate his framework; for in Hölderlin he sees the flower of German Neo-Hellenism; 'in none,' he says, 'does it appear stronger, purer and more beautiful' than in his poetry and prose. But even accepting Mr Montgomery's scheme as necessary, the results of his research are not displayed to the best advantage; he has endeavoured to make the general part appear ancillary to the particular, sometimes to the disadvantage of both. One feels that the first chapter, 'The Revival of Greek Studies in the Schools and Literature of Germany, with special reference to Gesner and Lessing,' ought to have been followed by a discussion—fuller than is given us—of the Neo-Hellenism of Goethe and Schiller; and that all this should have been immediately linked up with the chapter on 'Homer: from Barth to Hölderlin.' Instead, two chapters specifically dealing with Hölderlin ('Hölderlin's Contemporary Critics' and 'Hölderlin's Schools and Juvenilia to 1788') are intercalated between I and IV;

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

and again, why should Hölderlin's critics be discussed before his own early life? The volume ends with a chapter on the poet's 'Literary and Philosophical Studies at Tübingen, Waltershausen and Jena (1788–94)'; dealing, as it does, with the preparation for that great crisis in Hölderlin's life which was to give us the final *Hyperion*, this section comes short of what one might expect to find in it; but no doubt, much that might have been here is reserved for fuller treatment in the second part of the work.

Chapters I and IV are of the first importance; the latter, of nearly a hundred pages, seems to me, in particular, most admirable. The theme of Homer in modern literature had been already outlined by Finsler in his *Homer in der Neuzeit*, but Mr Montgomery gets considerably beyond Finsler. Lucidly and in comparatively brief compass, he describes the evolution of the European attitude—for he does not, and cannot, restrict himself to German opinion—to Homer in the eighteenth century. This matter is fundamental; for Homer is the fulcrum round which the classical controversy in its most fruitful aspect turns. To their other idols the writers and thinkers of the eighteenth century were strangely fickle—even Goethe vacillated in his attitude to great spirits of literature like Shakespeare—but in their devotion to Homer they never faltered. In Homer rather than in Aristotle, indeed, the key to eighteenth-century classicism is to be sought; by studying that century's literature in its relations to Homer one may get at its very heart. I think especially of this chapter in Mr Montgomery's book when I regret that his title reveals so imperfectly what he has given us. In Chapter II, it should be noted, there is a discussion, *à propos* of Hölderlin's youthful poem on the subject, of the Hero and Leander theme in German literature which no student of Schiller's ballad or Grillparzer's tragedy should overlook.

Mr Montgomery's discussion of Hölderlin's early years shows the exhaustive study he has brought to bear on his work. Perhaps he might have been less rigidly loyal to his immediate theme of 'Hölderlin's Hellenism,' and have dealt more comprehensively with Hölderlin the poet. We should have appreciated a fuller discussion of the early poems—to see them divested of their Klopstockian and Ossianic frothiness, and have their sterling poetic kernel revealed to us; we should have liked to hear more of the human side of the growing poet, including that idyllic first love—fresh with the freshness of the early dawn—for Louise Nast, as it is revealed in only too few poems and letters. Hölderlin's school curricula are, after all, dull things compared with the emotional development of one of the choicest poetic spirits German literature ever knew.

It is to be hoped that Mr Montgomery will not keep us too long waiting for Part II of his work, for this volume is obviously only the beginning. When he reaches *Hyperion* and *Empedokles*, he will have to grapple with the real problem of the significance of Hölderlin's Neo-Hellenism. So far, he has merely docketed Hölderlin's poetry and prose as the strongest, purest and most beautiful manifestation of German

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Neo-Hellenism; but there is so much more to be said about his work, that its Neo-Hellenism—after all, a very German Neo-Hellenism, viewed in the European perspective—may well turn out to be of subordinate importance. It seems to me that what matters in Hölderlin is rather his wonderful synthesis of pantheism and pessimism; his reconciliation of the idealism of the 'Sturm und Drang' age with that of Romanticism. This is a more precious contribution to German spiritual evolution—and to Hölderlin alone of his generation we owe it—than all his classic aspiration. But this is unfair anticipation, and I eagerly look forward to Mr Montgomery's statement of his case.

Hölderlin has come into his own in twentieth-century Germany; and we are grateful for a work like this, which cannot but stimulate an interest in him with ourselves. In none of the great literary figures of his age, except perhaps Novalis, did the flame of lyric genius burn purer than in this tragic youth whose life was so soon to go down into the darkness of insanity.

J. G. Robertson.

London.

Briefe der Brüder Grimm. Gesammelt von Hans Gürtler. Nach dessen Tode herausgegeben und erläutert von Albert Leitzmann. (*Jenaer Germanistische Forschungen*, I.) Jena: Frommann. 1923. 8vo. vii + 320 pp. 8 M.

A collection of hitherto unpublished letters of Jakob and Wilhelm Grimm happily inaugurates the new series of *Germanistische Forschungen* recently founded in Jena under the editorship of Professor Leitzmann. But for the untimely death of Dr Hans Gürtler in 1920, this volume was intended to be the first of three, which should contain the present collection, a considerable portion of the correspondence with Ludwig Grimm, and finally a chronological list of all the accessible letters of the two brothers Jakob and Wilhelm Grimm. It is to be hoped that this last volume—the work of the general editor of the series—may not be long delayed; it is pleasant to learn from the preface to the present book that his edition of the correspondence of the brothers with Lachmann is all but completed for publication.

It follows naturally from the plan of the work that the volume now published is in the nature of a book of reference rather than a biography. The letters of each brother are arranged alphabetically—according to the names of the recipients—and only within each group is the chronological order observed. For purposes of reference a chronological survey and a register of names are appended; the latter, especially, recommends the book for scientific work. The human interest of the letters is so great, however, that one may perhaps be pardoned for looking forward to the day when, after the completion of these records, their final transformation into biographical form will be undertaken. Meanwhile, this volume is a welcome addition to our knowledge of the lives and characters of the founders of 'Germanistik.' Many passages in the letters of Jakob Grimm are of general interest and throw light on the political

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

and social conditions of the age—the discussion of the situation between Hanover and Prussia, and of its effects on University politics (An Blume, November 4, 1838), or his personal views on the relations between Germany and France during the crisis of the time at Göttingen (An Smidt, April 26, 1837 and October 2, 1838) may be cited as examples. There is a pleasant picture of the general relations among scholars, in Germany and abroad, in his letters to J. M. Kemble (An Kemble, January 26, 1844 and May 15, 1846). But most interesting of all are the lights thrown on the characters of the two brothers. The earnest industry of Jakob Grimm appears predominantly throughout his correspondence—an almost religious zeal, a conscientiousness often oppressed by the gigantic mass of work he was able, somehow, to accomplish. Essentially modest, he yet shows a due appreciation of the dignity of his own labour; Wilhelm, on the other hand, is much more temperamental as to his own work, though constantly appreciative of his brother's. Characteristic of Jakob's whole mind is the judgment he passes in an early letter to Johann Smidt (January 19, 1816): 'Dennoch meine ich, dass des Lesens und Schreibens in Deutschland.....nach und nach weniger werden soll, politisch und sonst—dagegen das fromme Arbeiten, Säen und Pflügen in zufriedener Stille wieder mehr angehe, was unstreitig uns angemessener ist....' Equally characteristic is the sentence: 'man muss vor allen Dingen Liebhaber seyn, um Kenner zu werden' (An J. R. Wyss, October 10, 1819); here indeed one may find the clue to the success of the two brothers, as of all the great early 'Germanisten.' On the whole devoid of humour, the letters of Jakob are yet not lacking in shrewd judgments of friends and contemporaries—witness the descriptions of Bettina von Arnim and her conversation (An Blume, November 4, 1838 and June 30, 1841; An Kemble, December 1, 1838). But for the touch of humour in judgment we have to turn to Wilhelm's letters, where every now and then it appears: 'Tieck schwimmt hier in einem meer von ehre und glanz. Er schlürft das alles, wie seine natur ist, mit behaglichkeit und feinem genuss, als wäre es champagnerschaum' (An Blume, October 28, 1841). Kemble appealed to Wilhelm's natural love of mild gaiety: 'es ist überaus hübsch,' he writes to Blume, 'wenn ein mensch, der gelehrt ist, noch herzlich lacht' (An Blume, September 15, 1834). But his sensitiveness and sympathy do not prevent him from criticism as frank as it is kindly; this is notably the case in the letters to Simrock. Wilhelm's literary criticism is on the whole the more delicate and sympathetic; Jakob outweighs him in solid learning, and the many-sidedness of the latter's scholarship is clearly revealed throughout the letters. Wholly delightful is the picture of their reciprocal attachment, and their solicitude for all within the circle of their friends.

The interest of the volume is increased by the reproduction of two little-known portraits by Franz Krüger, originally published (with other sketches of his from the Berlin National Gallery) in 1883.

EDNA PURDIE.

BANGOR, N. WALES.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Language. An Introduction to the Study of Speech. By EDWARD SAPIR. Oxford: University Press. 1921. 8vo. vii + 258 pp. 8*s.* 6*d.*

Cours de Linguistique générale. Par FERDINAND DE SAUSSURE. Publié par Charles Bally et Albert Sechehaye avec la collaboration de Albert Riedlinger. Deuxième édition. Paris: Payot. 1922. 8vo. 331 pp. 12 fr.

Interest in general linguistics is undergoing a considerable revival, to judge from the number of publications during the last few years appealing to wider circles rather than exclusively to the philological specialist. It is remarkable how little overlapping there has been, a fact largely due to the very diverse fields of labour from which the subject has been approached. Thus Jespersen's *Language* and Vendryès' *Le langage* (Paris, 1921), though both start from Indo-European studies—Jespersen being first and foremost an Anglist and Vendryès a Celtist—supplement each other not only in respect of the illustrative material, but also in the general tendencies and principles of selection followed. Next we see the reclassification of the linguistic material of the mother tongue on psychological as opposed to the traditional formal principles successfully undertaken by A. Noreen in *Vårt Språk* (especially the 'Betydelselära' in vol. v) and by Brunot in *La Pensée et la Langue* (Paris, 1922). As compared with all these works, de Saussure's treatise —a posthumous collection of lectures, first published in 1916—is less an enumeration and interpretation of salient linguistic phenomena than an attempt to discover the basic principles of his science and elaborate a theory of linguistic method, an enterprise which has quite recently received further stimulus from the philosophical side in *The Meaning of Meaning* by Messrs Ogden and Richards (International Library of Psychology etc. London, 1923)[1]. Sapir's book, which these philosophical authors commend, not without justification, as one of the ablest and most interesting of recent linguistic studies, stands rather apart from the others. This author has the immense advantage of having done field work among the Canadian Indians, an experience which enables him to view Indo-European languages in better perspective than some who are totally immersed in them. It is not surprising that the most valuable and suggestive portions of his work are those which analyze Amerindian sentence-words (Chap. II) and the very full and challenging discussion of 'Types of Linguistic Structure' in Chap. VI. One of the statements is so important in connection with the question of 'entanglement' discussed by Jespersen in his section on 'The Origin of Language' that it is worth quoting: 'In the hundreds of pages of manuscript Nootka text that I have obtained from one of these young Indians the words, whether abstract relational entities like English *that* and *but* or complex sentence-words...are, practically without exception, isolated precisely as I or any other student would have isolated them' (p. 35, footnote). The

[1] This work is well supplemented by one written from the standpoint of philosophical Idealism, viz. E. Cassirer, *Philosophie der symbolischen Formen*, I, *Die Sprache* (Berlin, 1928).

Digitized by Google Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

classification of linguistic types boldly faces the various difficulties mentioned on pp. 129 *et seq.* (choice of criteria, maximum inclusiveness, resistance to the lure of simple formulae, counteraction of 'progressist' prejudices) and goes much further than Finck's *Haupttypen des Sprachbaus* (*Aus Natur und Geisteswelt*, 268). Here too we realize the value of the *méthode synchronique* so admirably treated by de Saussure. Sapir bases his tables on pp. 150–151 on four fundamental types: (*a*) *Simple pure-relational* languages like Chinese and Ewe, which express radical concepts (*house, kill*) and relational ideas (reference, modality, number, etc.), but do not possess the power—apart from the use of compounds —to modify the signification of the radical elements by means of affixes or internal change; (*b*) *Pure relational deriving languages* like Polynesian, Turkish, Sioux, Shilluk (Upper Nile) which keep the syntactic relations pure, e.g. Turk. *gelmelimek* 'to be obliged to come' < *gel* 'come' (radical) + necessitative + infinitive suffix, each suffix having a definite function as against say Lat. *-ī* which may stand at once for case, number and gender; (*c*) *Mixed relational non-deriving languages*, in which the term 'mixed' implies that abstract relational concepts like subjectivity are expressed in necessary connection with more concrete relational concepts like gender, number, but which possess little power of affixing or internal modification (Sapir cannot find a good representative, though Bantu and French fulfil some of the conditions); (*d*) *Mixed relational deriving languages* like English, Latin etc., Semitic, Chinook, in all of which syntactic relations are expressed in mixed form, but in which the significance of the radical elements may be modified by means of affixes or internal changes, cf. Lat. *dom-in-us* < root + personal agentive affix + affix expressing simultaneously subjectivity, singularity and masculinity. In the subdivisions according to (1) technique (isolating, agglutinative, fusional, symbolic) and (2) degree of synthesis (analytic, synthetic, polysynthetic) all the purely isolating languages necessarily fall under (*a*), whereas the other types of technique are distributed among all the other three. 'Fusional' indicates such coalescence between radical element and affix as occurs in *height, depth, children* as against the juxtaposing or agglutinative technique in *drinker, goodness*; 'symbolism' is exemplified by 'ablaut' or the well known Semitic procedure of vowel filling. Both terms might well be used in discussions on technique to replace the highly ambiguous 'inflective' or 'inflexional.'

No less interesting are Sapir's introductory remarks on the nature of language as a 'purely human and non-instinctive method of communicating ideas, emotions and desires by means of a system of voluntarily produced symbols' (p. 7), a definition good so far, but tending to obscure unduly the *expressive* side of language. On p. 14 the author tentatively suggests that language may be not so much a garment as a prepared road or groove for thought, that language is an instrument originally put to uses lower than the conceptual plane—a view ably maintained by Ogden and Richards in *The Meaning of Meaning*, Chap. x, 'Symbol situations,' and strikingly illustrated by Malinowski's appendix on 'Primitive Languages,' *op. cit.* pp. 451 *et seq.*—and that thought arises as a refined interpretation of the content of language. Further, he marks off

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

thought from imagery without, however, defining either more exactly. The question of the priority of thought to speech is a thorny one and there is much food for reflection in the chapter on 'Denken und Sprechen' in Dr Ernst Otto's *Zur Grundlegung der Sprachwissenschaft* (Leipzig, 1919), in Ach's *Über die Willenstätigkeit und das Denken* (Göttingen, 1905) and in the monographs by Bühler and Messer adduced by Otto *loc. cit.* Otto asserts confidently (*op. cit.* p. 47): 'Dass der Zusammenhang der Gedanken das sachlich Erste ist, wird auch durch die experimentelle Psychologie bestätigt.' However, Ach's 'Bewusstheit' (*das Gegenwärtigsein eines unanschaulich gegebenen Wissens*) and Messer's 'Sphärenbewusstsein' (*eigenartiger Zustand, in welchem man genau weiss, in welchen Bereich von Gedanken das Wort gehört*, illustrated by our frequent substitutions of cognate concepts like *black—white*) have not yet achieved universal acceptance, cf. for instance Helen M. Clarke, 'Conscious Attitudes' (*American Journal of Psychology*, vol. XXII, pp. 214–249) and Josephine M. Gleason, 'An experimental study of feelings of relation' (*ibid.*, vol. XXX, pp. 1–26). Sapir is at any rate on safer ground when he says (p. 21) that ease of linguistic transference, e.g. telegraphic codes or bodily gestures, shows 'that the mere sounds are not the essential part of language, which lies rather in the classification, in the formal patterning and in the relating of concepts.'

Many other points invite comment. Even where the author is less at home, as in his treatment of Germanic phenomena in Chap. VIII, he is always stimulating. Some discussions like that on 'Language and Literature' in Chap. XI necessarily suffer from lack of elbow-room, as do also the passages in which Sapir rather too summarily dismisses the various explanations of sound-change (p. 196). However, fortunately, this question bulks large in Jespersen's book[1] and de Saussure devotes a whole section of his *Cours* (pp. 202–208) to 'causes des changements phonétiques,' among which he accords—like Jespersen—a certain amount of support to the ease-theory (*Cours*, p. 204). No work on general linguistics can cover the whole field in a reasonable compass, but Sapir has been highly successful in presenting a clear and independent survey within the limits he has set himself. A good index is provided.

De Saussure's book calls for little comment as the present issue of a second edition has undergone very little change and the author's views are pretty widely known. Among his original contributions of value we may note his theory of 'syllabation,' according to which the passage from implosion to explosion marks the 'frontière de syllabe' (p. 86). Like most of the French treatises (Vendryès, Dauzat) de Saussure's book is very instructive on dialect geography (Pt. IV, 'Linguistique géographique,' Chap. II). It is disappointing that the theory of signs does not go deeper, cf. the remarks of Ogden and Richards, *op. cit.* pp. 5–8. But otherwise the work merits the popularity with which it has been received.

W. E. COLLINSON.

LIVERPOOL.

[1] Cf. further the section on the Causes of Speech changes in Pollak's German edition of selections from Noreen's work, *Einführung in die wissenschaftliche Betrachtung der Sprache* (Halle, 1923), pp. 147–157.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

MINOR NOTICES.

Dr Rudolf Hittmair's dissertation on *Das Zeitwort 'Do' in Chaucers Prosa* (*Wiener Beiträge zur Englischen Philologie* LI, Wien und Leipzig, W. Braumüller, 1923) is a very solid piece of work which takes full account of previous investigations in the same field. Dr Hittmair points out that the periphrastic use of *do*, first common in Lydgate, is rarely, if ever, found in Chaucer. He argues ably that this use sprang out of the factitive use, an expression like 'he does build a house' gradually losing its factitive sense. Child influence probably operated here. Another factor may have been constructions in which a noun came to be mistaken for a verb ('If jelousie doth thee paine' etc.). Dr Hittmair bases his conclusions largely on Chaucer's translation of Boethius, which he considers a landmark in the history of English prose. He has an interesting comparison of this translation with those of Alfred, Walton, Colville and Queen Elizabeth.

Dr Hittmair makes a slip on p. 26 if he implies that the statement 'I did a favour to John' can give rise to the question 'Whom did you do a favour?' and 'I did John a favour' to the question 'What did you do John?' The interrogative form of course requires 'To whom' and 'to John.' But this correction does not affect Dr Hittmair's main point. On p. 68, ll. 7, 8 the two sentences are not parallel, as 'do' in the first has a sense of its own, different from that of 'kisse.'

G. C. M. S.

The Early English Text Society's edition of *Ludus Coventriæ or the Plaie called Corpus Christi* from Cotton MS. Vespasian D. viii (Extra Series, no. CXX, Oxford University Press) is one of the volumes which, due some years ago, have been long delayed in publication. The series of plays which it contains is well known, and, apart from the complete edition produced by Halliwell for the Shakespeare Society in 1841, selections and single plays from the cycle have been frequently edited by scholars and antiquaries. The present edition, appearing in 1922, is just two hundred years later than the earliest attempt to make the contents of the MS. public: it was in 1722 that John Stevens printed the opening Proclamation and the first five plays among his addenda to the *Monasticon Anglicanum*. Excellent as Halliwell's text was, he allowed himself some freedom in his arrangement of the plays and his disturbance of the original numbering. Miss K. S. Block, who is responsible for the new edition, has paid special attention to the relation between the numbering of the plays in the text and their order as announced in the Proclamation, and shows that the correspondence between the two is more exact than is generally supposed. Her study of the handwritings, rubrication and corrections in the MS. is very thorough, and, although she has used her judgment in omitting some

Digitized by Google

Original from
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

of the less important corrections, her textual notes are satisfactory proof that she has spared no pains to note everything that is of real significance. In discussing the problems presented by the series, she is working in a field which has not been neglected by other students. Her conclusions, however, stated with necessary caution, are founded upon independent examination of a peculiarly close character. Her introduction leaves nothing to be desired as a piece of scholarly exposition and argument. As regards the compilation of the plays, she admits that the evidence of the MS. is 'complicated and often ambiguous,' and is somewhat inconclusive. She derives, however, from its characteristics the assurance that it is the compiler's book, and not a transcript, that it was compiled upon a plan which was subject to alteration as it proceeded, that some of the plays collected in it were originally separate pieces or groups of pieces, that one, and probably two of its portions, viz., the first Passion play and a large part of the second, also had a separate existence, and, finally, that the compiler had access to other versions of plays upon which he drew. The theory of the ecclesiastical origin of the series, as distinct from that of the ordinary pageant cycle, is fully discussed, and it is suggested that the misleading title *Ludus Coventriæ*, given to the plays by Richard James, Sir Robert Cotton's librarian, is a general term to describe the type of play, taken from the most familiar example of a series of the kind, without special reference to the place at which it was acted. An examination of the literary sources of the plays adds much weight to the theory of composition deduced from the internal evidence of the MS., involving the combination and revision of separate parts as a compact whole. It is acknowledged that the *Ludus Coventriæ* is inferior in purely literary quality to other cycles, but, in compensation, the editor points out its dramatic merits and shows that to a medieval audience it offered special attractions and a variety of movement and action which gave it special virtue on the stage.

A. H. T.

The Pepysian Gospel Harmony, edited by Margery Goates (E.E.T.S. Original Series, no. 157, Oxford University Press), is a Middle English MS., written about 1400, and now in the Pepysian Library at Magdalene College, Cambridge. Catalogued by Pepys and labelled as a collection of Wycliffe's sermons, its true nature was first discovered in 1902 by Miss A. C. Paues, to whom this volume is appropriately inscribed. The Harmony is of the type which endeavours to combine the accounts of the life of Christ given in the Gospels into a continuous narrative. The intrinsic interest of the text, apart from its linguistic value, lies in the occasional comments and homely touches introduced for the sake of bringing the story vividly home to the readers. A synopsis of these is given in the introduction: the Harmonist was a man of some wit and imagination, who pictured to himself the incidents of which he wrote and added original embellishments, slight but telling, to his paraphrase. Miss Goates has edited the work with detailed attention to its language and with keen appreciation of the writer's individuality. She has failed

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

to discover the source from which he worked, but she makes out a good case for his use of a French original. The occasional employment of anglicised forms of French words, mistakes which are explained by mistranslations of words or by ambiguities of gender, transferences of French idioms into English, and the general French element in the vocabulary, afford strong proof of her contention. One or two of the loan-words which she quotes, however, such as 'daubed' and 'chesible,' do not necessarily point to an immediate French source. The dialect employed is characterised as in the main a Southern variety of East Midland: although there is no very clear indication of the precise locality, the predominance of southern over northern forms is apparent on the whole. The collotype reproduction of two leaves and part of a third which forms the frontispiece of the volume is, as in most of the E.E.T.S. publications, admirably clear.

A. H. T.

The Foundation of St Bartholomew's Church in London (E.E.T.S., Orig. Series, No. 163), is issued in the year of the eight hundredth anniversary of St Bartholomew's Priory. This English text, also written within a few years of 1400, and preserved in Cotton MS. Vespasian B. ix, was taken in hand some forty years ago by the late Sir Norman Moore, whose brief introduction bears the date 1885. It is a translation of a Latin original, composed towards the end of the twelfth century, which occupies the earlier part of the original MS. The edition, incomplete at the time of the editor's death, has been revised and provided with a glossary by Miss M. M. Weale. The foot-notes, referring chiefly to the Latin of the original and to points of chronology, are short but useful: it is noteworthy that in one of the later chapters (bk. II, ch. xxii, p. 58)—not, as stated in the introduction, in the middle of the MS.—the translator has inadvertently described 1159, a mistake for 1169, as the sixteenth year of *Richard* II instead of Henry II. The book needs a somewhat fuller commentary and critical apparatus, and it seems to have escaped the notice of those responsible for its completion that a text of the English version has already appeared as an appendix to the first volume of Mr E. A. Webb's *The Records of St Bartholomew's Priory*, published in 1921.

A. H. T.

To students of Elizabethan literature Mr F. I. Carpenter's modestly-entitled *Reference Guide to Edmund Spenser* (University of Chicago Press, 1923) will be invaluable. It is a full bibliography of Spenserian literature, classified under seventy or more heads as the literature touches on phases of the poet's life or thought, or on particular works, and it is a critical bibliography, i.e. the entries are enriched by some critical estimate added by the editor. It is completed by an excellent Index. The existence of this Index makes one wonder if there is any advantage in having the entries under a particular head, e.g. 'Shepherd's Calendar,' arranged in alphabetical order of the authors' names, rather than by date. A chronological arrangement would have shown more

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

clearly the relation to one another of the chief critical contributions to our understanding of the topic. However one is shy of questioning an arrangement which has no doubt been carefully considered by the editor. As to the entry on p. 106 under 'Almack, Edward,' it seems to me that Mr Almack gives little ground for his belief that his copy of the FQ had belonged to Gabriel Harvey. The manuscript notes are not, I think, in Harvey's hand, and the book, if it ever were Harvey's, is exceptional in not containing his autograph or monogram. On p. 116 it might have been stated that Dean Kitchin's editions are bowdlerized. On p. 229, under 'Alabaster,' 'siquis' in the 1st and 3rd lines of the epigram should apparently be 'si quis.'

G. C. M. S.

Mr A. W. Pollard's *English Miracle Plays, Moralities and Interludes* has been known and valued by all students of our pre-Elizabethan drama since its appearance in 1890. In the seventh edition (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1923), Mr Pollard has rewritten the general introduction from p. xlix and the special introductions on Rastell and Heywood in the light of new knowledge due to the researches of Mr A. W. Reed.

G. C. M. S.

The Literary History of Hamlet. I. The Early Tradition, by Kemp Malone (*Anglistische Forschungen*, Heft 59; Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1923, 8vo., vii + 268 pp.) is the first instalment of a work in three parts dealing with 'a literary history of the hero Hamlet and the Hamlet saga.' It discusses the origin of the hero and the tale and their development in early tradition. Professor Malone intends to deal with the period from Saxo to Shakespeare in the second instalment and with the post-Shakespearean period in the third.

As far as one can see, it is the first part of the voyage which is the most hazardous. The author is fully aware of the dangers that beset him where landmarks are few and charts deceptive. In his preface he tells us frankly that 'he has felt it his duty to advance a clear-cut theory on every question at issue, or at any rate to give his opinion, even when the evidence available was too scanty to permit of well-fortified conclusion.' These words denote the courage of the author and the character of the book. Professor Malone has an explanation for everything. Sometimes we may agree with him, sometimes we may not, but everywhere we admire the erudition and the ingenuity which he brings to his task. Whether the reader will be convinced by Professor Malone's attempt to trace the motives of the Hamlet story in the old sagas is by no means sure, but at least he will have made the acquaintance of some acute speculations on obscure points in old Germanic literature.

H. G. W.

Professor F. W. Moorman's library edition of the *Poetical Works of Robert Herrick* appeared in 1915. A smaller edition, delayed by war-conditions and by Professor Moorman's lamented death, has now appeared with a valuable Prefatory Note by Mr Percy Simpson.

Digitized by Google

Original from
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

(London: H. Milford, 1921, 5*s*.) With its 'Additional Poems not included in "Hesperides" or "Noble Numbers,"' its occasional textual notes and its two indices (of titles and of first lines), it makes an extremely handy and delightful volume. Some of the additional poems have been found in MS. commonplace-books. We wonder if this source has been sufficiently investigated. The poem 'Fly to my Mistresse, pretty pilfring Bee' appears in Ashm. MS. 38, fo. 152 'Fly to my mistriss yellow-footed bee,' a picturesque variant which must surely be Herrick's own. The poem 'A little mushroome table' has 'musrumpe' in Add. MS. 22603, fo. 61, 'mushromp' in Ashm. MS. 38, fo. 100. Other poems attributed to Herrick in manuscripts are 'Whether are all her false oathes blown' (Add. MSS. 19268, fo. 22 and 33998, fo. 82 v.), 'Fayre maid, you did but cast' (Add. MS. 33998, fo. 82 v.), 'Go and wth this parting kisse' (Add. MS. 22603, fo. 41 v., and Ashm. MS. 38, fo. 93), 'Full as a bee with thyme' ('R. H.' Add. MS. 25303, fo. 157), 'Nay read and spare not' (Add. MS. 33998, fo. 33 v.), 'Whose head is fringed' (Ashm. MS. fo. 87). Can none of these be included in the canon?

G. C. M. S.

In *The Romance of Tristram and Ysolt by Thomas of Britain, Translated from the Old French and Old Norse* (New York, Dutton. $2.50), Professor Roger Sherman Loomis presents a popular reconstruction of the story, in a translation 'generally close and in large measure literal,' which differs from that of M. Bédier in supplementing the gaps in the text of Thomas by renderings from Robert's *Tristansage*. The result gives the English reader a complete and eminently readable version of the immortal story, in pleasantly antiquated language, and the illustrations, reproductions of the pavement tiles from Chertsey Abbey, add to the attractiveness of the volume. A passage in the introduction, concerning the 'doctrine of the inferiority of women' and the removal of the word 'obey' from the marriage service, tempts us to remind Prof. Loomis that the word in question is unknown in the matrimonial ritual of the Church of Rome.

E. G. G.

Signor G. S. Gargàno—whose pleasant critical studies are familiar to readers of the *Marzocco*—tells us that the essays brought together in *Scapigliatura italiana a Londra sotto Elisabetta e Giacomo I* (Florence: Battistelli. 1923, L. 8) are the result of long researches on the possible relations between Shakespeare and Italians who were in London between the end of the sixteenth and beginning of the seventeenth century. Though these investigations proved practically fruitless as far as the immediate object was concerned, we are nevertheless given 'un quadro d'ambiente' of great interest and well documented. The Italy of Campanella and Galileo was most unworthily represented in London between 1590 and 1615—the years that these essays cover—by types like Paolo Gondola, the merchant of Ragusa, Ottaviano Lotti, the resident diplomatic agent of the Grand Duke of Tuscany, Antonio Foscarini, the ambassador of the Republic of Venice, and, in a minor

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

degree, by Costantino De Servi, an artist who was associated with Thomas Campion in the composition of masques; not to speak of religious impostors like the Archbishop of Spalato, Antonio De Dominis, who temporarily gained the favour of King James by denouncing the Babylon of Rome. No doubt, as Signor Gargàno observes, these persons contributed to form the unfavourable opinion generally held by Englishmen on the subject of Italy and the Italians—of which, however, there is scarcely a trace in Shakespeare himself—but their proceedings are entertaining reading. The book is a real contribution to our knowledge of Italian life in London at the time of Shakespeare.

E. G. G.

The English reader could not have a more inviting introduction to the literature of Norway than the volume of *Chapters on Norwegian Literature* by Illit Grøndahl, lecturer in Norwegian at the University of London and Ola Raknes, who formerly occupied a similar position at the Sorbonne (London: Gyldendal. 1923. viii + 308 pp. 16*s.*) The two authors have divided the task of covering the literature from Holberg to the present day; but even if the Preface did not indicate their respective shares, the reader would have little difficulty in distinguishing between the two hands; they differ materially in style and method of approach. The book is designed for a wide audience, and the quotations of Norwegian verse are reproduced (sometimes, but not always, with English help) into often exceedingly successful English versions. Of the chapters we have appreciated most the warm estimate of Wergeland and the clear and well-balanced account of the rise of a national language in Norway, perhaps the most interesting 'philological' event of recent times. Norway has triumphantly non-plussed the prophets of a generation and more ago, and has now not merely established her 'Landsmaal,' but has succeeded in 'nationalising' the literary Danish to a degree which will surprise the foreign reader who knows his 'Norwegian' only from Ibsen and Bjørnson. The chapters on the latter writers are perhaps less likely to satisfy an English public, which has been accustomed to think of them in terms of European rather than national values: and there is a similar interesting disparity between Norway's attitude to some of her living writers, as here defined, and the European attitude. But this is necessarily the case with all contemporary literatures, and in none more than with our own—witness our standing quarrel with the Swedish Academy over the Nobel literary prize! The importance, however, of Messrs Grøndahl and Raknes' volume lies just in the fact that it helps us to see Norwegian literature with Norwegian eyes; we are grateful to them for providing us with, we will not say a corrective, but at least a steadying influence in forming our English attitude to this, the youngest and freshest of the modern literatures of Europe.

J. G. R.

Digitized by Google

Original from
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

December, 1923–February, 1924.

GENERAL.

ABERCROMBIE, L., The Theory of Poetry. London, M. Secker. 5*s.*

COLLINS, J., The Doctor looks at Literature. London, Allen and Unwin. 12*s.* 6*d.*

DUKES, ASHLEY, The Youngest Drama. London, Benn. 8*s.* 6*d.*

ERNST, F., Der Klassizismus in Italien, Frankreich und Deutschland. Vienna, Amalthea. 25,000 kr.

KALFF, G., De Sage van den Vliegenden Hollander. Zutphen, W. J. Thieme. 3 fl. 90.

KNOWLTON, E. C., Genius as an Allegorical Figure (*Mod. Lang. Notes*, xxix, 2, Feb.).

MANITIUS, M., Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters. II. Munich, C. H. Beck. 19 M.

Manly Anniversary Studies in Language and Literature. Chicago, Univ. of Chicago Press.

MIGNON, M., Étude sur le Théâtre français et italien de la Renaissance. Paris, H. Champion. 12 fr.

MURRY, J. M., Poncillings. Little Essays on Literature. London, Collins. 7*s.* 6*d.*

ROHR, F., Parzival und der heilige Graal. Eine neue Deutung der Symbolik der Graldichtungen. Hildesheim, F. Borgmeyer. 8 M.

SAINTSBURY, G., A Second Scrap-Book. London, Macmillan. 7*s.* 6*d.*

SCHÜCKING, L. L., Die Soziologie der literarischen Geschmacksbildung (Philosophische Reihe, lxxi). Munich, Rösl. 2 M. 70.

TAILHADE, L., Des tragédies d'Eschyle au pessimisme de Tolstoi. Paris, Nouv. Revue crit. 6 fr. 75.

THURNEYSEN, R., Eine irische Parallele zur Tristan-Sage (*Zeitschr. f. rom. Phil.*, xliii, 4, Feb.).

ROMANCE LANGUAGES.

Italian.

ANTONA-TRAVERSI, C., Briciole foscoliane. Città di Castello, Il Solco. L. 6.

ARCARI, P., Manzoni. Milan, Casa editr. Alpes. L. 6.

BELLEZZA, P., Curiosità manzoniane. Milan, Vallardi. L. 9.

BIANCHI, D., La teoria e la realtà dell' arte di G. B. Niccolini (*Giorn. stor. della lett. ital.*, lxxxii, 3).

DANTE ALIGHIERI, Il Canzoniere. A cura di G. Zonta. Turin, Paravia. L. 9.

FATINI, G., Su la fortuna e l' autenticità delle liriche di L. Ariosto (*Giorn. stor. della lett. ital.*, Suppl. 22–23).

GALLIANI, F., Del dialetto napoletano. Con introd. e note di F. Nicolini. Naples, Ricciardi. L. 15.

GIUSTI, G., Vita, scritta da lui medesimo. Pubblicata da G. Biagi. Florence, Le Monnier. L. 4.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

LEOPARDI, G., Puerili e abbozzi vari. A cura di A. Donati. Bari, Laterza. L. 20.

Manzoni, Nel Cinquantesimo della morte di A. A cura del R. Istituto Lombardo di Scienze e Lettere. Milan, Hoepli. L. 12.

MARINO, G. B., Idillii favolosi. Con Introd. e note di G. Balsamo-Crivelli. Turin, Unione Tip. L. 10.

MAYNIAL, E., Ibsen et Fogazzaro (*Rev. litt. comp.*, iv, 1, Jan.).

MISTRUZZI, V., G. Cotta (*Giorn. stor. della lett. ital.*, Suppl. 22–23).

NASELLI, C., Il Petrarca nell' Ottocento. Naples, Perrella. L. 60.

NEGRI, L., La luce nella filosofia naturale del '300 e nella 'Commedia' (*Giorn. stor. della lett. ital.*, lxxxii, 3).

ORTIZ, R., Per la 'medievalizzazione' di Dante (*Zeitschr. f. rom. Phil.*, xliii, 3).

ORTIZ, R., Studi sul Canzoniere di Dante. Bucarest, Casa delle scuole. L. 7.50.

PORTAL, E., L'Arcadia. Palermo, Sandron. L. 8.50.

SANTINI, E., L' eloquenza italiana dal Concilio Tridentino ai nostri giorni. Palermo, Sandron. L. 15.

SHACKFORD, M. H., The Magi in Florence: an Aspect of the Renaissance (*Stud. Phil., Nth. Carolina*, xx, 4).

TOFFANIN, G., L' Eredità del Rinascimento in Arcadia. Bologna, N. Zanichelli. L. 24.

ZACCAGNINI, G., Cino da Pistoia fu di parte bianca o nera? (*Giorn. stor. della lett. ital.*, lxxxii, 3).

ZARDO, A., G. Gozzi nella letteratura del suo tempo in Venezia. Bologna, N. Zanichelli. L. 15.

Spanish.

Celestina. Transl. from the Spanish by James Mabbe. Ed. by H. Warner Allen. (Broadway Translations.) London, G. Routledge. 12*s.* 6*d.*

HÄMEL, A., Juan de la Cueva und die Erstausgabe seiner Comedias y Tragedias (*Zeits. f. roman. Phil.*, xliii, 2).

LEAVITT, S. E., Argentine Literature. A Bibliography of Literary Criticism, Biography and Literary Controversy (Univ. of Nth. Carolina Studies in Lang. and Lit., i). Chapel Hill, N. C., Univ. of Nth. Carolina Press.

LULL, RAMÓN, The Book of the Lover and the Beloved. Transl. from the Catalan, with an Introductory Essay by E. Allison Peers. London, Soc. Prom. Christ. Knowl. 3*s.* 6*d.*

MÉRIMÉE, E., Précis d'Histoire de la littérature espagnole. Paris, Garnier.

PEERS, E. A., Rivas and Romanticism in Spain. Liverpool, Univ. Press. 6*s.*

PLACE, E. B., María de Zayas, an outstanding Woman Short-story Writer of seventeenth-century Spain (Univ. of Colorado Studies, xiii, 1). Boulder, Col., Univ. of Colorado.

French.

(*a*) *General* (*incl. Linguistic*).

BAUZAT, A., Essais de géografie linguistique. 2e série. (*Rev. phil. franç.*, xxxv, 2.)

BILLER, Remarques sur la syntaxe des groupes de prépositions dans les premiers romans français. Paris, H. Champion. 15 fr.

BRUN, A., Introduction de la langue française en Béarn et en Roussillon. Paris, H. Champion. 6 fr.

BRUN, A., Recherches historiques sur l'introduction du français dans les provinces du midi. Paris, H. Champion. 27 fr.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

CLÉDAT, L., En marge des grammaires. Les modes et particulièrement le subjonctif (*Rev. phil. franç.*, XXXV, 2).

KREDEL, E., Studien zur Geschichte des Wortspiels im Französischen (Giessener Beitr. zur roman. Phil., XIII). Giessen, Roman. Seminar. 4 M. 50.

PINLOCHE, A., Vocabulaire par l'image de la langue française. Paris, Larousse. 18 fr.

ZAUNER, A., Zum Verstummen der Auslautkonsonanten im Französischen (*Leuvensche Bijdragen*, XV, 3).

(*b*) *Old French. Anglo-Norman.*

Cambridge Anglo-Norman Texts. Poem on the Assumption, ed. by J. P. Strachey; Poem on the Day of Judgment, ed. by H. J. Chaytor; Divisiones Mundi, ed. by O. H. Prior. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 7*s.* 6*d.*

EKER, S. J., Syntaxe du participe passé en ancien français. Toulouse, Impr. du centre.

HOLBROOK, R. T., 'Ci falt la geste que Turoldus declinet' (*Mod. Phil.*, XXI, 2, Nov.).

JEANROY, A., Jongleurs et troubadours des 12e et 13e siècles. Paris, H. Champion. 3 fr. 50.

JORDAN, L., Zum altfranzösischen Fergusroman (*Zeits. f. roman. Phil.*, XLIII, 2).

LOWE, L. F. H., Gérard de Nevers. A study of the Prose Version of the Roman de la Violette (Elliott Monographs, XIII). Princeton, Univ. Press. $1.

Roman de la Rose, Le. IV. Éd. E. Langlois (Soc. des anciens textes franç.). Paris, H. Champion. 25 fr.

Roman des Romans, Le. An Old French Poem ed. by I. C. Lecompte (Elliott Monographs, XIV). Princeton, Univ. Press. $1.25.

ROYER, L., Un texte inédit de 1302 en langage de Grenoble (*Rev. phil. franç.*, XXXV, 2).

(*c*) *Modern French.*

ALMERAS, H. D', Les premiers romans de Balzac (*Rev. bleue*, Feb. 2).

BARRÈRE, L'humanisme et la politique dans le 'Discours de la servitude volontaire' d'É. de la Boétie. Paris, H. Champion. 20 fr.

BELLESSORT, A., Balzac (*Rev. hebdom.*, Feb. 2, 9, 16).

BEMENT, N. S., Balzac's Rate of Production (*Mod. Lang. Notes*, XXXIX, 1, Jan.).

BOILLOT, F., Les sensations éruditives chez La Fontaine (*Rev. d'hist. litt.*, XXX, 3).

BRÉMOND, H., Pour le romantisme. Paris, Bloud. 10 fr.

CAILLAT, J., La méthode scientifique selon Pascal (*suite*) (*Rev. d'hist. litt.*, XXX, 3).

CHINARD, G., Volney et l'Amérique (Johns Hopkins Studies in Romance Literature, I). Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press.

CHOUVILLE, L., A. Chénier chez V. Hugo (*French Quart.*, V, 3, Sept.).

CLOUARD, H., La Poésie française moderne. Paris, Gauthier-Villars. 15 fr.

COHEN, G., Ronsard, sa vie, son œuvre (*Rev. des cours et conf.*, Jan. 30).

CONSTANS, A., An Unpublished Criticism of Voltaire's 'Eryphile' (*Publ. M. L. A. Amer.*, XXXVIII, 4, Dec.).

DAWSON, E., H. Becque, sa vie et son théâtre. Paris, Payot. 7 fr. 50.

DEBIDOUR, A., L'indianisme de Voltaire (*Rev. litt. comp.*, IV, 1, Jan.).

DU BELLAY, J., Œuvres poétiques, publ. par H. Chamard. V. Paris, Hachette. 20 fr.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

ESTÈVE, É., Études de littérature préromantique. Paris, H. Champion. 15 fr.

ESTÈVE, É., A. de Vigny, sa pensée et son art. Paris, Garnier. 10 fr.

FAGUET, É., L'Éducation littéraire des hommes de la Pléiade (*Rev. des cours et conf.*, Jan. 30).

FRANÇOIS, A., Matériaux pour la correspondance de J.-J. Rousseau. Paris, Hachette. 20 fr.

GIRARD, H., La Préface des études françaises et étrangères d'É. Deschamps. Paris, Presses françaises. 8 fr.

GIRAUD, J., A. de Musset prosateur. L'art dans l'imitation (*Rev. d'hist. litt.* XXX, 3).

GROS, É., Le Cid après Corneille (*Rev. d'hist. litt.*, XXX, 4).

HASTINGS, W. S., An Unpublished Correspondence of H. de Balzac (*Mod. Lang. Notes*, XXXIX, 2, Feb.).

HAXO, H., P. Bayle and his literary taste (*Publ. M. L. A. Amer.*, XXXVIII, 4, Dec.).

HERVIER, M., Le thème initial de 'L'Automne' de Lamartine chez quelques poètes plus anciens (*Fr. Quart.*, V, 3).

HÉRÉDIA, J. M. DE, Poésies complètes. Paris, Lemerre. 50 fr.

HOLSEN, K., Madame de Staël. Fransk forfatterinde og politiker. Kristiania, H. Aschehoug. 6 kr. 50.

IBROVAC, M., J. M. de Hérédia. Les Sources des Trophées. Paris, Presses françaises.

IBROVAC, M., J. M. de Hérédia, sa vie, son œuvre. Paris, Presses universitaires.

LARAT, J., Bibliographie critique des Œuvres de Ch. Nodier. Paris, H. Champion.

LARAT, J., Étude sur les origines du romantisme français. La tradition et l'exotisme dans l'œuvre de Ch. Nodier (1780–1844). Paris, H. Champion.

LASSERRE, P., Controverses. Paris, Plon-Nourrit. 7 fr. 50.

LE BRETON, A., Balzac. Paris, Boivin. 5 fr.

LOVEJOY, A. O., The Supposed Primitivism of Rousseau's 'Discourse on Inequality' (*Mod. Phil.*, XXI, 2, Nov.).

MAGNE, E., Scarron et son milieu. Paris, Émile Paul. 5 fr. 50.

MARTINO, P., Fromentin. Essai de bibliographie critique. Paris, H. Champion. 2 fr. 50.

MARTINO, P., La poésie symboliste : Verlaine (*Rev. des cours et conf.*, Dec. 30, Jan. 30).

MEYER, E., Diderot. Paris, Boivin. 5 fr.

MONTAIGNE, M. DE, Œuvres complètes. I. Conrad. 25 fr.

MORÉAS, J., Œuvres. I. Paris, Mercure de France. 15 fr.

PASCAL, B., Œuvres complètes. Notes de F. Strowski. I. Paris, Ollendorff. 40 fr.

PASCAL, B., Pensées. Notes de M. Espiard. 2 vols. Paris, Larousse. 9 fr.

REFORT, L., L'Art de Michelet dans son œuvre historique jusqu'en 1867. Paris, H. Champion. 15 fr.

REFORT, L., Essai d'introduction à une étude lexicologique de Michelet. Paris, H. Champion. 10 fr.

RICKEL, H., The Wisdom of Balzac. New York, Putnam. $3.50.

ROE, F. C., Taine et l'Angleterre. Paris, H. Champion. 15 fr.

RONSARD, P., Œuvres complètes. Publiées par H. Vaganay. V, VI. Paris, Garnier. Each 7 fr. 50.

ROOSBROECK, G. L. VAN, Notes on Voltaire (*Mod. Lang. Notes*, XXXIX, 1, Jan.).

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

SPOERRI, T., A propos de la sincérité de Pascal (*Rev. d'hist. litt.*, XXX, 3).

TROTAIN, M., Les scènes historiques. Étude du théâtre livresque à la veille du drama romantique. Paris, H. Champion. 10 fr.

VILLEY, P., Marot et Rabelais (Les Grands Écrivains du XVIe siècle, i). Paris, H. Champion. 25 fr.

WOLLSTEIN, R. H., English Opinions of French Poetry, 1660–1750 (Columbia Univ. Studies in Romance Phil. and Lit.). New York, Columbia Univ. Press. London, H. Milford. 9*s*.

GERMANIC LANGUAGES.

Scandinavian.

ANDREWS, A. LE ROY, Studies in the Fornaldarsǫgur Norðrlanda (*Mod. Phil.*, XXI, 2, Nov.).

BLÖNDAL, S., Islandsk-dansk Ordbog. II. Halvbind, 1. Hæfte. Copenhagen, H. Aschehoug. 17 kr.

BOER, R. C., Het poëtisch karakter der Edda. Rede. Haarlem, H. D. Tjeenk Willink. 90 c.

COLLIN, C., B. Bjørnson. 2 vols. 2. Utg. Kristiania, H. Aschehoug.

HOLBERG, B., Comoedierne. Tekstredaktion og Kommentar ved C. Roos. I. Copenhagen, H. Aschehoug. 12 kr.

Holberg Aarbog, 1923. Redaktion: F. Bull og C. S. Petersen. Copenhagen, Gyldendal. 9 kr.

KNUDSEN, T., P. A. Munch og Samtidens norske Sprogstrev. Kristiania, Gyldendal. 6 kr. 50.

KUYLENSTIERNA, O., Svensk rokoko människor och dagligt liv. Stockholm, Bonnier. 9 kr. 50.

NIELSEN, H., Moderne Litteratur. Kritiske Skitser. Ny Samling. Copenhagen, H. Aschehoug. 6 kr. 50.

NOREEN, A., Studier rörande Eufemia visorna. I. Uppsala, Almqvist och Wiksell. 2 kr.

PETERSEN, C. S. og V. ANDERSEN, Illustreret dansk Litteraturhistorie. 11. Hæfte. Copenhagen, Gyldendal. 1 kr. 50.

PIPPING, H., E. Sievers und die Metrik der Eddalieder (*Neuphil. Mitt.*, XXIV, 7, 8).

RODE, H., Regenerationen i vort Aandsliv. Udvalgte Kritiker. I. Copenhagen, Gyldendal. 6 kr. 75.

RYDBERG, V., Brev. I. Stockholm, Bonnier. 12 kr.

STURTEVANT, A. M., The Relation of Old Norse -rð- to Gothic -rd- (*Journ. Engl. Germ. Phil.*, XXII, 3).

TOPSØE, V., Udvalgte Skrifter. Ved V. Andersen og H. Topsøe-Jensen. 2. og 3. Hæfte. Copenhagen, Gad. Each 4 kr.

Dutch, Flemish.

DAMBRE, O., Onderzoek naar het ontstaan van J. De Harduijn's 'Roosemond' (*Leuvensche Bijdragen*, XV, 3).

HAAN, J. C. DE, Studiën over de Romeinsche elementen in Hooft's niet dramatische poëzie. Antwerp, De Sikkel. 2 fl. 25.

Lancelot of Denmark. Translated from the Middle Dutch by P. Geyl. (Dutch Library, i.) The Hague, M. Nijhoff.

MANSION, J., Toponymica (*Leuvensche Bijdragen*, XV, 3).

SCHEURLEER, D. F., Nederlandsche liedboeken. Lijst der in Nederland tot het jaar 1800 uitgegeven liedboeken. I. Suppl. The Hague, M. Nijhoff. 3 fl.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

English.

(*a*) *General* (*incl. Linguistic*).

ARONSTEIN, P., Englische Stilistik. Leipzig, Teubner. 4 M. 60.

CHAMBERS, R. W., Concerning certain great Teachers of the English Language. Inaugural Lecture. London, E. Arnold.

CROLL, M. W., Music and Metrics: a Reconsideration (*Stud. Phil., Nth. Carolina*, XX, 4).

DEWEY, G., Relative Frequency of English Speech Sounds. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 12*s.* 6*d.*

Giessener Beiträge zur Erforschung der Sprache und Kultur Englands und Nordamerikas. Herausg. von W. Horn. I, 1–4. Giessen, Engl. Seminar. 4 M.

LEE, SIR S., and F. S. BOAS, The Year's Work in English Studies, 1922. Edited for the English Association. London, H. Milford. 7*s.* 6*d.*

(*b*) *Old and Middle English.*

COOK, A. S., Beowulf, 1422 (*Mod. Lang. Notes*, XXXIX, 2, Feb.).

CURRY, W. C., 'O Mars, O Atazir' (*Journ. Engl. Germ. Phil.*, XXII, 3).

FLASDIECK, H. M., Die sprachliche Einheitlichkeit des Orrmulums (*Anglia*, XLVII, 4, Jan.).

HESSLER, L. B., The Latin Epigram of the M. E. Period (*Publ. M. L. A. Amer.*, XXXVIII, 4, Dec.).

HINTON, J., Notes on Walter Map's 'De Nugis Curialium' (*Stud. Phil., Nth. Carolina*, XX, 4).

Layamon's Brut. Selections, ed. by J. Hall. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 6*s.* 6*d.*

MCCAUSLAND, E., The Knight of Curtesy and the Fair Lady of Fagnell (Smith College Studies in Modern Languages, IV, 1).

MAP, W., De Nugis Curialium (Courtiers' Trifles). Englished by F. Tupper and M. Bladen Ogle. London, Chatto and Windus. 21*s.*

RANKIN, J. W., The Hymns of St Godric (*Publ. M. L. A. Amer.*, XXXVIII, 4, Dec.).

Religious Lyrics of the Fourteenth Century. Ed. by Carleton Brown. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 10*s.* 6*d.*

SERJEANTSON, M. S., Distribution of Dialect Characters in Middle English. Amsterdam, Swets en Zeitlinger.

WRIGHT, J. and E. M. WRIGHT, An Elementary Middle English Grammar. London, H. Milford. 7*s.*

(*c*) *Modern English.*

ADKINS, N. F., Wordsworth's 'Margaret, or the Ruined Cottage' (*Mod. Lang. Notes*, XXXVIII, 8, Dec.).

ARNOLD, M., Unpublished Letters. Ed. by A. Whitridge. New Haven, Yale Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 6*s.* 6*d.*

Asloan Manuscript, The. A Miscellany of Prose and Verse written by John Asloan in the Reign of James V. Ed. by W. A. Craigie. I. The Scottish Text Society. Edinburgh, Blackwood.

ASQUITH, H. H. Studies and Sketches. London, Hutchinson. 10*s.* 6*d.*

BAILEY, M., Boswell as Essayist (*Journ. Engl. Germ. Phil.*, XXII, 3).

BEATTY, J. M., Doctor Johnson and 'Mur' (*Mod. Lang. Notes*, XXXIX, 2, Feb.).

BOUTET DE MONVEL, R., La vie de Lord Byron. Paris, Plon-Nourrit. 12 fr.

BREDVOLD, L. I., The Naturalism of Donne in Relation to some Renaissance Traditions (*Journ. Engl. Germ. Phil.*, XXII, 3).

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

BREDVOLD, L. I., The Source used by Davies in 'Nosce Teipsum' (*Publ. M. L. A. Amer.*, xxxviii, 4, Dec.).

BRIGGS, W. D., Marlowe's 'Faustus,' 305–28, 548–70 (*Mod. Lang. Notes*, xxxviii, 7, Nov.).

BULLOCK, W. L., The Genesis of the English Sonnet Form (*Publ. M. L. A. Amer.*, xxxviii, 4, Dec.).

BURT, E. J., The Seen and the Unseen in Browning. Oxford, Blackwell. 6*s.*

Byron, the Poet. A Collection of Addresses and Essays. Ed. by W. A. Briscoe. London, Routledge. 12*s.* 6*d.*

CAMPBELL, O. W., Shelley and the Unromantics. London, Methuen. 16*s.*

Canadian Prose and Verse, A Book of. Compiled by E. K. and E. H. Broadus. London, Macmillan. 12*s.*

CARHART, M. S., The Life and Work of Joanna Baillie (Yale Studies in English). New Haven, Yale Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 8*s.* 6*d.*

CHAMBERS, E. K., The Elizabethan Stage. 4 vols. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 70*s.*

CHISLETT, W., The Classical Influence in English Literature in the 19th Century, and other Essays. Boston, Stratford Co.

CLARK, D. L., Rhetoric and Poetry in the Renaissance. A Study of Rhetorical Terms in English Renaissance Literary Criticism (Columbia Univ. Studies in Engl. and Compar. Literature). New York, Columbia Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 9*s.*

COLE, H. W., The Influence of Plautus and Terence upon the Stonyhurst Pageants (*Mod. Lang. Notes*, xxxviii, 7, Nov.).

D'OLIVET, F., Cain, by Lord Byron. Transl. into French verse and refuted. Done into English by N. L. Redfield. London, Putnam. 17*s.* 6*d.*

DORMER, E. W., Gray of Reading. A Sixteenth Century Controversialist and Ballad-Writer. Reading, Bradley and Son. 15*s.* 6*d.*

DRINKWATER, J., Victorian Poetry. London, Hodder and Stoughton. 2*s.* 6*d.*

FARIES, R., Ancient Rome in the English Novel. Univ. of Pennsylvania Thesis. Philadelphia, Univ. of Pennsylvania.

FEHR, B., Englische Literatur des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts. Heft 4. Berlin, Athenaion. 2 M. 20.

GALLAND, R., G. Meredith. Paris, Presses françaises. 30 fr.

GIARTOSIO DE COURTEN, M. L., Shelley e l' Italia. Milan, Treves. L. 10.

GOODE, C. T., Byron as Critic. Weimar, Wagner. 8 M.

GRAVES, T. S., Some Pre-Mohock Clansmen (*Stud. Phil., Nth. Carolina*, xx, 4).

GREY, VISCOUNT, Wordsworth's Prelude (Engl. Association Pamphlets, lvii). 1*s.*

HARRIS, F., Contemporary Portraits. Fourth Series. London, Grant Richards. 10*s.* 6*d.*

HARRISON, G. B., Shakespeare's Fellows. Being a brief chronicle of the Shakespearean Age. London, J. Lane. 6*s.*

HESPELT, N., Shelley and Spain (*Publ. M. L. A. Amer.*, xxxviii, 4, Dec.).

HOOKES, N., Amanda. A Sacrifice to an Unknown Goddesse. London, E. Matthews. 10*s.* 6*d.*

HUBBARD, F., The Readings of the First Quarto of 'Hamlet' (*Publ. M. L. A. Amer.*, xxxviii, 4, Dec.).

IDMAN, N., C. R. Maturin. London, Constable. 7*s.* 6*d.*

JONES, R. F., Nationalism and Imagism in Modern American Poetry (*Washington Univ. Studies*, xi, Human. Ser. 1).

KILLEN, A., Le roman terrifiant ou roman noir de Walpole à Anne Radcliffe et son influence sur la littérature française. Paris, H. Champion. 10 fr.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

KOCH, J., Thomas Nabbes (*Anglia*, xlvii, 4, Jan.).

Lancashire Anthology, A. Selected and edited by M. Yates. Liverpool, Univ. Press. 10*s*. 6*d*.

LAWRENCE, W. J., The Problem of Lyly's Songs (*Times Lit. Suppl.*, Dec. 27).

LONGUEIL, A. E., The Word 'Gothic' in 18th Century Criticism (*Mod. Lang. Notes*, xxxviii, 8, Dec.).

MARR, G. S., The Periodical Essayist of the Eighteenth Century. Edinburgh, J. Clark. 8*s*. 6*d*.

MASSON, R., The Life of R. L. Stevenson. London, Chambers. 10*s*. 6*d*.

NICHOLS, C. W., Fielding's 'Tumble-Down Dick' (*Mod. Lang. Notes*, xxxviii, 7, Nov.).

RICKETT, E., Political Propaganda and Satire in 'A Midsummer Night's Dream.' II. (*Mod. Phil.*, xxi, 2, Nov.)

RODOCANACHI, R., Byron, 1788–1824. Paris, Hachette. 12 fr.

ROLLINS, H. E., An Analytical Index to the Ballad-Entries (1557–1709) in the Registers of the Company of Stationers (*Stud. Phil., Nth. Carolina*, xxi, 1). Chapel Hill, Univ. of Nth. Carolina Press. $3.

SCHMIDT, E., Das Ausland in Smolletts Romanen (Giessener Beiträge zur engl. Lit.). Giessen, Englisches Seminar. 75 Pf.

SCHOELL, F. L., Les mythologistes italiens de la Renaissance et la poésie élisabéthaine (*Rev. litt. comp.*, iv, 1, Jan.).

SHAKESPEARE, W., The Tragicall Historie of Hamlet Prince of Denmarke. Ed. by G. B. Harrison (Bodley Head Quartos). London, J. Lane. 3*s*.

SHAKESPEARE, W., Love's Labour's Lost (Cambridge Shakespeare). Cambridge, Univ. Press. 7*s*. 6*d*.

Shorter Poems of the Eighteenth Century. An Anthology. Ed. by I. A. Williams. London, Heinemann. 10*s*. 6*d*.

SIM, F. M., Robert Browning, Poet and Philosopher, 1850–1889. London, Fisher Unwin. 10*s*. 6*d*.

SPENCER, H., Hamlet under the Restoration (*Publ. M. L. A. Amer.*, xxxviii, 4, Dec.).

SPIRA, T., Shelleys geistesgeschichtliche Bedeutung (Giessener Beiträge zur engl. Lit. 1, 2, 5). Giessen, Englisches Seminar. 5 M.

SQUIRE, J. C., Essays on Poetry. London, Hodder and Stoughton. 7*s*. 6*d*.

STEVENSON, R. L., Selected Essays. Ed. by H. G. Rawlinson. London, H. Milford. 4*s*. 6*d*.

TICKNOR, C., Glimpses of Authors. London, Werner Laurie. 15*s*.

TURNER, A. M., Wordsworth and Hartley Coleridge (*Journ. Engl. Germ. Phil.*, xxii, 4).

VILLARD, L., Jane Austen. A French Appreciation. Transl. by V. Lucas. London, G. Routledge. 10*s*. 6*d*.

WALPOLE, H., Journal of the Printing-Office at Strawberry Hill. Now first printed. Ed. by P. Toynbee. London, Constable. 42*s*.

WATSON, SIR JAMES, The Dialect of R. Burns, as spoken in Central Ayrshire. London, H. Milford. 6*s*.

WILLIAMS, S. T., Studies in Victorian Literature. New York, E. P. Dutton. $3.

WILLIAMS, S. T., W. S. Landor as a Critic of Literature (*Publ. M. L. A. Amer.*, xxxviii, 4, Dec.).

WOODS, M. L., A Poet's Youth [Wordsworth]. London, Chapman and Dodd. 7*s*. 6*d*.

WRIGHT, W. H. K., John Gay. Biography. London, Warner. 42*s*.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

German.

(*a*) *General* (*incl. Linguistic*).

BEHAGHEL, O., Die deutsche Sprache. Neue Aufl. Leipzig, G. Freytag. 5 M.

BEHAGHEL, O., Deutsche Syntax. II. (Germanische Bibliothek, i, 1, 10.) Heidelberg, C. Winter. 10 M.

KIRK, A., An Introduction to the Historical Study of New High German (Germanic Series, ii). Manchester, Univ. Press. 6*s*.

KOPPELMANN, H., Romanischer Einfluss auf das Westgermanische (*Journ. Engl. Germ. Phil.*, xxii, 4).

MÜLLER, J., Rheinisches Wörterbuch. I, 2. Bonn, Schroeder. 2 M.

NADLER, J., Literaturgeschichte der deutschen Stämme und Landschaften. II. 2. Aufl. Regensburg, J. Habbel. 12 M.

SEILER, F., Die Entwicklung der deutschen Kultur im Spiegel des deutschen Lehnwortes. III, 1 (2. Aufl.) und 8, 4. Teil. Halle, Waisenhaus. 8 und 4 M.

SÜTTERLIN, L., Neuhochdeutsche Grammatik mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der neuhochdeutschen Mundarten. I. Munich, C. H. Beck. 14 M. 50.

WELLANDER, E., Studien zum Bedeutungswandel im Deutschen. II. (Uppsala Univers. Årsskrift, 1923, iv.) Uppsala, A. B. Lunderquist. 6 kr.

ZIRKER, O., Die Bereicherung des deutschen Wortschatzes durch die spätmittelalterliche Mystik (Jenaer germ. Forschungen, iii). Jena, Frommann. 3 M. 50.

(*b*) *Old and Middle High German.*

HAGEN, F. H. VON DER, Minnesinger. Anast. Neudruck. 4 vols. Leipzig, J. A. Barth. 198 M.

HOMAN, B., Geschichtliches im Nibelungenlied (*Ungar. Jahrb.*, iii, 3).

NEIDHART VON REUENTHAL, Lieder. Herausg. von M. Haupt. 2. Aufl., neu bearbeitet von E. Wiessner. Leipzig, S. Hirzel.

LÖWIS OF MENAR, A., Die Brünnhildsage in Russland (Palaestra, cxlii). Leipzig, Mayer und Müller. 2 M.

(*c*) *Modern German.*

BAUMGARTNER, A., Goethe. Neubearbeitung von A. Stockmann. I. Freiburg, Herder. 14 M.

BERTAUX, F., L'Influence de Zola en Allemagne (*Rev. litt. comp.*, iv, 1, Jan.).

BIRVEN, H., Goethes Faust und der Geist der Magie. Leipzig, Talis-Verlag. 3 M.

BORNSTEIN, P., F. Hebbels Persönlichkeit. Gespräche, Urteile, Erinnerungen. 2 vols. Berlin, Propyläen-Verlag. 18 M.

BROOKS, N. C., The Mastersinger Stage (*Journ. Engl. Germ. Phil.*, xxii, 3).

BÜLOW, P., F. Lienhard. Der Mensch und das Werk. Leipzig, M. Koch. 12 M.

CASTIGLIONI, M., Il poema eroico di F. Nietzsche. Turin, Bocca. L. 25.

CATTANÈS, H., Les Fastnachtspiele de Hans Sachs (Smith College Studies in Mod. Languages, iv, 2, 3). Northampton, Mass., Smith College.

CORIN, A. L., Lettres de J. Ernest Wagner à J. P. F. Richter (*Leuvensche Bijdragen*, xv, 3, 4).

Eichendorff-Kalender. Ein romantisches Jahrbuch, xv. Munich, Parcus und Co. 5 M.

FARINELLI, A., G. de Humboldt et l'Espagne. Goethe et l'Espagne (Letterature Moderne, vii). Turin, Bocca. L. 28.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

FEHRLIN, H., Die Paralipomena zu Immermanns 'Münchhausen' (Sprache und Dichtung, xxviii). Bern, Haupt. 4 M.

GOETHE, OTTILIE VON, Erlebnisse und Geständnisse. Herausg. von H. H. Houben. Leipzig, Klinkhardt und Biermann. 7 M. 50.

GRILLPARZER, F., Sämtliche Werke. Herausg. von A. Sauer. II, 5 (Jugendwerke); II, 10 (Tagebücher). Vienna, A. Schroll.

GRILLPARZER, F., Selbstbiographie und Bildnisse. Herausg. von L. Böck und W. Engelmann. Vienna, Wiener Drucke.

GRILLPARZER, F., Weh' dem, der lügt. Ed. by G. Waterhouse. Manchester, Univ. Press. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Grillparzer-Studien. Herausg. von O. Katann. Vienna, Gerlach und Wiedling.

GUNDOLF, F., Martin Opitz. Munich, Duncker und Humblot. 1 M. 20.

HATZFELD, A. VON, Aufsätze (Arnim, Keller etc.). Hanover, Steegemann. 2 M.

HIEBER, H., E. Mörikes Gedankenwelt. Stuttgart, Strecker und Schröder. 2 M.

HILDEBRAND, S., 'Die Discourse der Mahlern' und 'Der Mahler der Sitten.' Uppsala, Almquist och Wiksell.

HOLL, K., Geschichte des deutschen Lustspiels. Leipzig, J. J. Weber. 14 M. 25.

HOUBEN, H. H., Verbotene Literatur von der klassischen Zeit bis zur Gegenwart. I. Berlin, Rowohlt. 20 M.

HOWE, G. M., A Probable Source of Grillparzer's 'Sappho' (*Journ. Engl. Germ. Phil.*, xxii, 4).

JANSEN, H., Ein ungedruckter Brief Goethes (*Journ. Engl. Germ. Phil.*, xxii, 4).

KAUFMANN, H., Die Dichtung der Rheinlande. Bonn, Schroeder. 3 M.

KOEHLER, S., The Question of Moral Responsibility in the Dramatic Works of A. Schnitzler (*Journ. Engl. Germ. Phil.*, xxii, 3).

KORFF, H. A., Geist der Goethezeit. I. Sturm und Drang. Leipzig, J. J. Weber. 10 M. 50.

KURRELMEYER, W., Wieland's 'Teutscher Merkur' and Contemporary English Journals (*Publ. M. L. A. Amer.*, xxxviii, 4, Dec.).

LÖNS, H., Sämtliche Werke. 8 Bände. Herausg. von F. Castelle. Leipzig, Hesse und Becker. 80 M.

MANUEL, C., J. Gotthelf. Leben und Schriften. Munich, Rentsch. 2 M.

MAY, K., Lessings und Herders kunsttheoretische Gedanken in ihrem Zusammenhang (German. Studien, xxv). Berlin, Ebering. 4 M. 40.

NAUMANN, H., Die deutsche Dichtung der Gegenwart (1885–1923). Stuttgart, Metzler. 6 M. 50.

PAULI, J., Schimpf und Ernst. Herausg. von J. Bolte. I. Berlin, Stubenrausch. 22 M.

REINSCH, F. H., Goethe's Political Interests prior to 1787 (Univ. of California Publ. in Mod. Phil., x, 3). Berkeley, Cal., Univ. of California Press. $1.25.

SCHLEGEL, A. W. VON, Vorlesungen über dramatische Kunst und Literatur. Kritische Ausgabe. Herausg. von G. V. Amoretti. 2 vols. Bonn, Schroeder. 16 M.

SCHÜTZE, M., The Fundamental Ideas in Herder's Thought. V. (*Mod. Phil.*, xxi, 2, Nov.).

SILZ, W., Freytag's 'Soll und Haben' and Raabe's 'Der Hungerpastor' (*Mod. Lang. Notes*, xxxix, 1, Jan.).

STAMMLER, W., Deutsche Literatur vom Naturalismus bis zur Gegenwart. Breslau, F. Hirt. 2 M. 50.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

TENGLER, R., Schopenhauer und die Romantik (German. Studien, xxix). Berlin, Ebering. 2 M. 80.

TIEGHEM, P. VAN, Les Idylles de Gessner et le rêve pastoral dans le préromantisme européen (*Rev. litt. comp.*, iv, 1, Jan.).

Von deutscher Art und Kunst. Ed. by E. Purdie. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 5*s*.

WAGNER, H. L., Gesammelte Werke. I. Herausg. von L. Hirschberg. Potsdam, Hadern-Verlag. 11 M.

WITKOP, P., Deutsche Dichtung der Gegenwart. Leipzig, H. Haessel. 3 M. 20.

Digitized by Google

Original from
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

VOLUME XIX JULY, 1924 NUMBER 3

ROBERT SOUTHWELL'S 'SAINT PETER'S COMPLAINT' AND ITS ITALIAN SOURCE.

To anybody acquainted with both English and Italian literature, the very title of Robert Southwell's *St Peter's Complaint* would at once suggest a comparison with Luigi Tanzillo's *Le Lacrime di San Pietro*. It is therefore strange that Mr Harold H. Child, in his contribution to the *Cambridge History of English Literature* (vol. IV, ch. VII, [1909]), while affirming that 'Southwell, *almost certainly*, was a student at first hand of the Italian poetry which had been the origin of the "conceits" then common in English poetry,' did not try to base his supposition on firmer ground. Even more strange is the fact that Father H. Thurston, in *The Month* for Sept. 1905 (p. 318), actually pointed out the Italian source, but was not able to trace any close parallelism between the two poems short of the general idea of the piece and sundry details of the treatment which might have remained in Southwell's memory. As to these latter, however, he added that 'it does not seem on the whole too rash to conclude that while Father Southwell was beholden to his Italian rival for the suggestion of the theme, his treatment of the subject was entirely original.' As a matter of fact Father Thurston produces only two instances of similarity in particular passages, which, oddly enough, chance to be by no means the most striking ones. I quite agree that at first sight it may seem rather hazardous to maintain that in the treatment of details Southwell keeps close to Tanzillo's poem as considered in its definitive text. Single comparisons would at first elude the reader, owing to the quite different character which Tanzillo's poem presents as a whole: *Le Lacrime di San Pietro* is couched in a rather heavy narrative style, whereas Southwell's *Complaint* contains no single narrative passage, but strikes us as thoroughly lyrical. There is however evidence that the draft of the Italian poem which Southwell knew was much closer to the English *Complaint*. What everybody seems to have as yet overlooked are the so-called additional stanzas which Dr Grosart quotes at the end of his edition of Southwell's works, labelling them *interlineations and studies for the poem*. These stanzas, headed *Peeter Playnt*, are, in Southwell's autograph, written in three pages and a half of a little quire (otherwise blank) of twelve pages

Digitized by Google Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

(each page $6\frac{6}{10} \times 4\frac{3}{10}$ inches; two watermarks: 1. bird over three mountains; 2. sea-gull ?): the quire belongs to Stonyhurst College and is bound (sig. MS. A. V. 27) together with other autograph material, all save one piece written on similar paper, folded in different sizes. Stonyhurst College has also a handsome MS. copy of the Poems, with a few autograph corrections (sig. MS. A. V. 4), where *St Peter's Complaint* figures as a poem of twelve stanzas (see below). The so-called *interlineations and studies* prove to be nothing more than a close translation of *Le Lacrime di San Pietro*, Canto I, stanzas 51–63 and the two first lines of 66: I refer for the quotation of the Italian stanzas to Tommaso Costo's edition of Tanzillo's poem (1606), which comes nearer than any other to the original MS. of Tanzillo, but a study of the text of *Le Lacrime* leaves no doubt that Southwell translated from an earlier draft of that poem, namely from the fragment of it issued first in 1560 at Venice under the name of Cardinal de' Pucci, and reprinted under the name of the real author in several selections[1]. Before deciding whether Southwell became acquainted with Tanzillo's poem through one of those issues, or rather through a MS. copy, let us see how his translation agrees with the poem as given in the fragment. This begins with the very stanza which figures first in the translation, and not only corresponds at every point to the English text (as none of the complete editions does), but *provides stanza* 66 *immediately after* 63. Here I give Southwell's text with the Italian below it[2]:

~~The~~ Peeter Playnt

peer
That sturdy peter an did boaste
The champion stout which did with othe avowe
Amyds a thousand pyckes and blody blades
At his deare masters syde to yeld the ghoast

Tanzillo's *Lacrime di San Pietro* (fragment).

Il magnanimo Pietro, che giurato
Havea tra mille lancie, e mille spade
Al suo caro Signor morir a lato,

[1] *Lagrime di S. Pietro del Reverendiss. Cardinale de' Pucci.* Together with *Il Secondo Libro dell' Eneide di Virgilio...tradotto in ottava rima da* G[iovan] M[ario] V[erdizzotti] etc. In Venezia, appresso Francesco Rampazzetto, 1560. The selections including the same fragment are: Agostino Ferentilli's *Primo volume della Scelta di stanze di diversi autori toscani*, Venezia, 1571 (reprints in 1579, 1584); *Salmi penitenziali di diversi eccellenti autori con alcune rime spirituali di diversi*, ed. by P. Franc. Turchi da Trivigi, carmelitano, 1572; Zabata's *Nuova scelta di rime di diversi begli ingegni*, Genova, 1573; and *Prima parte della scelta di rime di diversi autori*, Genova, 1582.

[2] The present transcription is made directly from the original, Grosart having been found to be not very accurate. The most striking blunders he commits are: *premiss* for *promiss* (st. 1, l. 5); *loth* for *both* (st. 1, l. 7); *bought* for *vought* (probably = avouched) (st. 3, l. 3); *new* for *nere* (= never) (st. 3, l. 3) so that the sentence 'he *nere* folower was,' translating '*giamai* seguace non fu,' is stultified into 'he *new* folower was'; *attyned* for *attyred* (st. 12, l. 2). Moreover Grosart omits a few erased words and sentences.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Peeter Playnt

Perceyving that he conquered of two mades — when dasht w^th dread
his credit distayne — and cowardlyce he fades
Even at the pinch from promiss did ~~d~~ retyre
angry smart — and at the pinch his
The shame the pitye and the grypyng griefe — loyalty faith doth stayne
Both of his falt and of his masters payne
~~A thousand daggers stabbed in his hart~~
puniardes ~~pushes~~ stabbe
did w^th A thousand ~~woundes~~ ~~prickyns~~ ~~pearce~~ his harte

The bowes which ~~shott the so~~ leveld at his dolful brest
The sha^rpest arows and most deadly flyghts
Were theis of Chryste when they on him did rest
These eyes were bowes there lookes lyke arowes lyght
Which not content to hurt his heavy hart
glanced to the soule
~~Even pea lanced the soule~~ and wounded in such wyse
he was fayne till
That al his dayes while lyf did quyte departe
to still — to oynt the wounds to bath y^e sores
He oynted it with liquour of his eies

once to a minion bold face
Thre severall tymes ~~twy~~ se by two handmades woyce
next ~~once~~ to a man last to that revyl rout
~~and last by meanes of that accursed crue~~
vought ~~adheren~~ — he was not of the fold
He sed and swore ~~that he nere folower was~~ ~~made his choise~~
adherents never
of Chrysts whome he ~~denyed that he~~ knew
~~to folowe Chryst a man he never knew~~
But when
The cocke had chased out this ~~stubberne~~ brall
in as thing
and brought ~~the~~ day for witnes of the cryme
stubborn
~~When as~~ the ~~wh~~ wretch scarse markyng yet his fall
Did with his eies meete theies of Christ his king

Tanzillo's *Lacrime di San Pietro* (fragment).

Poi che s' accorse vinto da viltade
Nel gran bisogno aver di fè mancato,
Il dolor, la vergogna, e la pietade
Del proprio fallo, e de l' altrui martiro
Di mille punte il petto gli feriro.

Ma gli archi, che nel petto gli avventaro
Le saette più acute, e più mortali,
Fur gli occhi del Signor quando il miraro;
Gli occhi fur gli archi, e i guardi fur gli strali;
Che del cor non contenti sen passaro
Fin dentro a l' alma, e vi fer piaghe tali,
Che bisognò mentre che visse poi
Ungerle col licor de gli occhi suoi.

Tre volte haveva a l' importuna e audace
Ancella, al servo, et a la turba rea
Detto e giurato, che giamai seguace
Non fu del suo Signor, nè 'l conoscea:
E 'l gallo publicatol contumace
Il dì chiamato in testimon v' havea,
Quando del suo gran fallo a pena avvisto
S' incontrar gli occhi suoi con quei di Cristo.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Peeter Playnt.

In what distresse pore peeter did remayne
at this encountrynge ech with others eies
Let no man vant that he cann mak it playne
~~It is for mean to great an enterpryse~~
No tunge can reache the truthe scarce mynde surmyse
It seemd that Chryst amids that iuysh crew
forlorne of ~~his~~ frends these speaches did reherse
Behold that which I sayed is now to viewe
O frende disloyall o discyple fierce
No youthful dame her beauti/uouse face in glasse
Of Christall bryghtnes did so wel discrye easely prie
As this old sely ~~se~~ wret did in this passe
foul de
In th' eies of Chryst his fylthye falt espye
Nor egre eare though covetous to heare
preache
and without pause attent to teachers speache
could learne so much in twyse two hundred yeares
in a turne
as with one looke he did in moment reach
it
lyke as sometyme (though unworthy be
to lyken sacred matters with profane)
by lookes a lover secret thoughts can se
e
~~se~~ and searche that hart thoughe it no words do frame
Let amorous knyghts trayn*d* up in cupids schoole
teache those w^ch^ are unskilful in this art,
openyng mouth
how without usynge tong or wrytynge toole
by lookes the lovers know ech others hart
the eies may serve for to display the hart

profaned thyngs
holy
in ~~sacred~~ talke
to name

Tanzillo's *Lacrime di San Pietro* (fragment).

Qual' a l' incontro di quegli occhi santi
Il già caduto Pietro rimanesse,
Non sia chi di narrarlo hoggi si vanti;
Che lingua non saria, ch' al ver giungesse.
Parea che 'l buon Signor cinto di tanti
Nemici, e de' suoi privo, dir volesse:
Ecco che quel, ch' io dissi, egli è pur vero,
Amico disleal, discepol fiero.

Giovane donna il suo bel volto in specchio
Non vide mai di lucido cristallo,
Come in quel punto il miserabil vecchio
Ne gli occhi del Signor vide il suo fallo:
Nè tante cose udir cupido orecchio
Potria, se stesse ben senza intervallo
Intento a l' altrui dir cento anni e cento,
Quante ei n' udio col guardo in quel momento.

Così tal' hor (benche profane cose
Siano a le sacre d' agguagliarsi indegne)
Scoprir mirando altrui le voglie ascose
Suole amator, senza ch' a dir le vegne.
Chi dunque esperto sia ne l' ingegnose
Scole d' Amor, a chi nol prova insegne,
Come senza aprir bocca, o scriver note
Con gli occhi ancora favellar si puote.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Peeter Playnt.

Ech a
~~every~~ eie of Chryst ~~seemd~~ runnyng tungue did seeme
peters ech lyk a listnyng
and ~~every~~ eis so many eagre eares
preest to receyve the voyce and it esteame
according to that sense that it should beare
more fierce he seemed to say ar thy eies
then the impious hands which shall naile me on the crosse
Nether feele I any blow which do so annoy me
gylty
Of so many wch this rable doth on me lay
as that blow which came out of thy mouth

eche ey of peter lyke a ~~running~~ listnynge eare

None ~~fayth~~ faythful found I none courteous
ch
of so many that I have vousafned to be myne
but thow in whome my was [*sic*] more kyndled
Art faythless and and [*sic*] ungratefull above all other
All other with there (cowardly) flyght did onely offend me
my
But thow hast denyed and now w^th^ the other (foes) ghilty
standest feedynd thy eies with my damage (and sorows)
As though part of this pleasur belonged unto the

Who by one and one could count
The wordes of wrath and of love full
Which peter seemed to se imprinted
In the holy gyre (compasse) o–[o *and letter erased*] those two calme
con
eies, it wold make him brast that could understand (perceive) them
for if from mortall eie often cometh

Tanzillo's *Lacrime di San Pietro* (fragment).

Ogni occhio del Signor lingua veloce
Parea che fusse, et ogni occhio de' suoi
Orecchia intenta ad ascoltar sua voce.
Più fieri (parea dir) son gli occhi tuoi
De l'empie man, che mi porranno in croce
Nè sento colpo alcun, che sì m'annoi
Di tanti, che 'l reo stuolo in me ne scocca,
Quanto il colpo, ch' uscìo de la tua bocca.

Nessun fedel trovai, nessun cortese
Di tanti c' ho degnato d' esser miei;
Ma tu, dove il mio amor via più s' accese,
Perfido e ingrato sovra ogn' altro sei:
Ciascun di lor sol col fuggir m' offese;
Tu mi negasti, et hor con gli altri rei
Ti stai a pascer del mio danno gli occhi,
Perche la parte del piacer ti tocchi.

Chi ad una ad una raccontar potesse
Le parole di sdegno e d' amor piene,
Che parve a Pietro di veder impresse
Nel sacro giro de le due serene
Luci, scoppiar faria chi l' intendesse:
Ma se d' occhio mortal sovente viene

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Peeter Playnt.

virtue, which hath force in us, He which proveth (this) let him gesse
what an eie divyne (or of God) is able to worke in mans senses

As a fold of snow which frosen
The winter in close valew hiddyn laye
At the sprynge tyde of the svn heated
doth quyte melt and resolve in to water
So the feare which ~~entred~~ entered was in the frosen hart
Of peter then when the truth he conceled
When toward him his eies he turned
did quyte thaw and into teares was resolved

He [*sic*] teres or weepyng were not as river or torrent
which at the scorchyng hot season could ever dry upp
for though Chryst king of heaven inmayntenant
did retorne him the grace which he had lost
yet all the ~~he~~ remnant of his lyf
There was never nyght but therin he did wake
Herynge the cock tell him how unfayful he had ben
and ~~ge//~~vynge new teares to his old falt

his chere
That face which litle before had ben
Attyred with the coloure of death
By reason of the blood which was retyred to the harte
leavyng th' other parts cold and pale

Tanzillo's *Lacrime di San Pietro* (fragment).

Virtù, che possa in noi[1], chi 'l prova pensi,
Che puote occhio divin ne gli human sensi.

Come falda di neve, che agghiacciata
Il verno in chiusa valle ascosa giacque,
A primavera poi dal Sol scaldata
Tutta si sface, e si discioglie in acque:
Così la tema, che entro al cor gelata
Era di Pietro allhor, che 'l vero tacque,
Quando Christo ver lui gli occhi rivolse
Tutta si sfece, e in pianto si risolse.

E non fu il pianto suo rivo o torrente,
Che per calda stagion giamai seccasse:
Che, benche il Re del Cielo immantinente
A la perduta gratia il ritornasse,
De la sua vita tutto il rimanente
Non fu mai notte, ch'ei non si destasse,
Udendo il gallo a dir quanto fu iniquo,
Dando lagrime nove al fallo antiquo.

Quel volto, ch'era poco inanzi stato
Asperso tutto di color di morte
Per lo sangue, che al cor se n'era andato,
Lasciando fredde l'altre parti e smorte,

[1] Southwell translates here as if the Italian text were: 'che *ha* possa in noi': no such reading however occurs in any of the editions of Tanzillo I have seen.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Peeter Playnt.

Of the beames of those holy eies warmed
as red as fyre
Waxed flame and by the same dores
that feare entred it vanished away
and in his due place shame appeared

Vewynge the wrech how diverse
from his former state he founde him self
him
His hart not suffysing to stand there presente
before his offended lord that so had loved him
without taryance for *f* the fierce or mercyful
sentence which the hard tribunal seat did give *on* him
from that odious ~~house~~ hated house that the*n* he was in
weepyng bitterly he went forth

And desyrous to encounter some that iust pena*n*ce (and pain)
would geve ~~*fo*~~ him for his grevous error

Tanzillo's *Lacrime di San Pietro* (fragment).

Dal raggio de' santi occhi riscaldato
Divenne fiamma, e per l' istesse porte,
Ch' era entrato, il timor fuggendo sparve;
E nel suo loco la vergogna apparve.

Veduto il miser quanto differente
Dal primo stato suo si ritrovava,
Non bastandogli il cor di star presente
A l' offeso Signor, che sì l' amava:
Senza aspettar se fiera, o se clemente
Sententia il duro Tribunal gli dava,
Da l' odiato albergo, ove era allhora,
Piangendo amaramente uscì di fuora.

E vago d' incontrar chi giusta pena
Desse al suo grave error.....

Thus Southwell's draft is rather to be described as a crude attempt at translation than as a serious one. It seems possible that the original intention of the English poet was simply to render the Italian poem into English, and that in the course of the work, finding his faculties for mere translation rather flagging, he felt sufficiently attracted by the subject as to prefer the writing of an entirely new poem. The character of the translation supports this view: it begins with verse, though of a very rugged sort; then the task seems to become easier for the poet (towards the fourth and fifth stanzas); but the improvement is not sustained and the enterprise is dismissed after the *bathos* of a dull prose rendering.

The fragment of the *Lacrime* covers stanzas 51–63, 66, 67, 70–84 of Canto I, 5–8, 10, 11 of Canto III, 23, 24 of Canto II, and the first four stanzas of the sixth Canto of the whole poem as edited by Costo in 1606.

Did Southwell know only that fragment, or more of the poem? A

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

very satisfying answer is supplied by a survey of *St Peter's Complaint*, the English poem that Southwell composed in imitation of *Le Lacrime di San Pietro*. The Stonyhurst MS. A. V. 4 contains only twelve out of the 131 stanzas which form the poem, viz. stanzas 10, 11, 28, 29, 14, 17, 30, 21, 22, 20, 23, 131, and the British Museum MS. Additional 10,422 contains not only the whole poem, but also the same twelve stanzas. Most of these stanzas, in the Stonyhurst as well as in the British Museum MSS., present a so much less polished form than their version in the longer poem, as to leave no doubt that this latter is to be considered a further expansion.

Now some of these twelve stanzas are obviously inspired by passages comprised in the Italian fragment: there is on the other hand evidence of derivation from passages of the *Lacrime* which do not appear in it. It is clear enough that the opening of stanza 10[1]:

> How can I live that have my life deny'de...

comes from the last couplet of Tanzillo's Canto I, 73:

> Ch' al gran periglio ricercando aita,
> *Per tema di morir negai la vita.*

And stanza 11:

> I vaunted erst though all his frendes had fayld
> Alone wth Christe all fortunes[2] to have tryde...

reminds one of Tanzillo's I, 51:

> Il magnanimo Pietro che giurato
> Havea tra mille lancie, e mille spade
> Al suo caro Signor morir a lato....

But stanzas 28, 29:

> If tyrans bloody thretts had me dismay'd
> Or smart of cruell torments made me yelde
> There had bene some p^{r}tence to be afrayde
> I should have fought before I lost the feilde
> But o infamous foyle a maydens breathe
> Did blowe me downe and blast my soule to death
>
> Was I to stay the Churche a chosen rocke
> That wth so soft a gale was overthrowne

are connected with Tanzillo's IV, 22:

> Forse ch' armata schiera empia, e proterva
> Tinta di sangue paventar mi fece,
> .....
> Una vil femminella, una vil serva
> Con semplice dimanda in me disfece
> Tutto il vigor, facendomi mentire,
> E negar quel, per cui dovea morire;

[1] I take the text of these twelve stanzas from Stonyhurst MS. A. V. 4, which I have collated with British Museum MS. Additional 10,422.

[2] This word appears to have been written at first *tortures*; then *f* and *n* were substituted by the same hand which corrected other places, i.e., Southwell's. British Mus. has *tourtures*.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

and with II, 21 and 45:

Tanto hebbe forza ad espugnar la rocca
De la mia mente, e soggiogarla ad ella
L'ignobil lingua d'una rozza e sciocca
Femina vil, d'un' ignorante ancella.

Pietra che non durò, nè 'n piè rimase
Al soffio d'un tarpato e picciol vento;

while the continuation of this stanza:

Terran dunque l'eterne ampie tue case,
Gran Re, per basso e debil fondamento?

as well as the preceding stanza 44:

Tu dicesti esaltando anco il mio nome,
Ch'er' io la pietra ben fondata, e dura,
Che sostener dovea le sante some
De l'alma Chiesa, e le sue eccelse mura.
Dunque or non vedi, o Re Celeste, come
Starà l'alta tua Reggia mal sicura
A' venti, a le tempeste, et a le piogge,
Se sopra pietra così mal l'appogge?

with 48 (and 49):

Se tu mi dai quel caro gregge a pascere...
.....
Come 'l potrò guidar, nudrire e scorgere...
.....
...a pastor, ch'egli stesso sì mal guidasi,
Non ben in guardia l'altrui mandra fidasi;

provide the model for Southwell's 29th stanza:

Was I to stay the Church a chosen rocke
That wth so soft a gale was overthrowne
Was I cheife pastour of the faithfull[1] flocke
To guide their[2] soules that murdred thus my owne
A rock of ruyne not a reste to staye
A pastour not to feede but to betraye

Now, neither Tanzillo's IV, 22, nor II, 21, 44, 45, 48 and 49 are included in the fragment. And again, Southwell's earlier version of stanza 30:

Where was the[3] harte that did so little feare
The armed troupes that him did apprehende
Where was the sworde that strooke of Malchus eare
Where was the faith of Christes professed frende...

together with the last couplet of 22:

Didst thowe to spare his foes putt up thy sworde
To brandish now thy tougue against thy lorde

and these lines of 23:

O tongue.....
.....
...every word was to his hart a wounde
And lawncd him deeper then a thousand swordes
What Jewish race[4] yea what infernall sprite
Could have disgorg'd against him greater spite

[1] Br. Mus.: *chosen.* [2] Br. Mus.: *ye.* [3] Br. Mus.: *my.* [4] Br. Mus.: *rage.*

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

recall not only Tanzillo's I, 57 :

> Nè sento colpo alcun, che sì m' annoi
> Di tanti, che 'l reo stuolo in me ne scocca,
> Quanto il colpo, ch' uscìo de la tua bocca ;

but chiefly IV, 24 :

> Lingua crudel, che non togliesti esempio
> Da questa man sì fida, la qual vaga
> Di turbar del suo Re l' indegno scempio,
> Ardita snudò ferro, e cruda piaga
> Stampò sul capo a l' orgoglioso et empio
> Nemico in mezzo a tanti : anzi presaga
> Che 'l reo stuol vinca, e 'l buon re perda e pera,
> Non si ritien, che non assalti e fera.

The earlier opening of 21 :

> I once designed Judge to loose and bynde
> Now pleade at mercyes barr as guilty thrall

derives obviously from Tanzillo's II, 28, which again does not figure in the fragment :

> Tu le chiavi mi desti, ond' apre e serra
> Mia man l' eterno Regno de' beati ;
> .....
> Se 'l buon là suso, e 'l reo mandar sotterra
> Debbo, secondo i meriti e i peccati,
> Visto il mio picciol merto, e 'l grand' eccesso,
> Loco nel Ciel non potrò darm' io stesso.

If those are the reminiscences in what is supposed to be the first draft of Southwell's poem, more traces yet of Tanzillo's *Lacrime* are to be found in the expanded form of it. I confine myself to the points in which the echo is beyond doubt, whereas the list could be much amplified if one were to quote the passages where—to use Father Thurston's words—the ideas may have occurred quite spontaneously to the later writer as an almost necessary development of his subject. Here are a few rapprochements[1] :

St Peter's Complaint.	*Le Lacrime di San Pietro.*
8. All weeping eyes resigne your teares to me,	I, 83. Quant' anime fur mai di gioia vote
A sea will scantly rince my ordur'd soule	E di duol piene, a tuo soccorso invoca. Prega che le lor doglie ascose e note Ti prestin tutte, e nel tuo sen le loca...

[1] I refer to Dr Grosart's text of *St Peter's Complaint* and to Tommaso Costo's edition of *Le Lacrime di San Pietro*. In this latter, a few words occur with a spelling slightly different from the one adopted in the corresponding passages of the fragment quoted above (cf. I, 60).

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

13. The borne-blind begger, for receivèd sight,
Fast in his faith and love to Christ remain'd ;
He stoopèd to no feare, he fear'd no might,
No change his choice, no threats his truth distain'd :
One wonder wrought him in his dutie sure,
I, after thousands, did my Lord abiure.

20. (*revised version*)
Blush, craven sot, lurke in eternall night ;
Crouch in the darkest caves from loathèd light.

31. In Thabor's ioyes I eger was to dwell :
An earnest friend while pleasures' light did shine,
But when eclipsèd glorie prostrate fell,
These zealous heates to sleepe I did resigne...

32. When Christ, attending the distresseful hower,
With His surchargèd breast did blesse the ground,
Prostrate in pangs, rayning a bleeding shower,

xv, 39. Dunque, gridò (come il dolente Piero
La lingua scioglier può, che 'l duol gli annoda)
Ad huom, cui nudo un tanto popol fiero
Schernisce, e 'ngiuria, e sferza, e fere, e 'nchioda,
Sì come a Re del Ciel possente e vero
Si volge in croce un reo, l'adora, e loda ;
E dagli, essendo anch'ei già nudo in croce,
Quanto può dar, col core e con la voce ?

40. E negol' io, che tante volte il vidi
Dar legge a l'onde, e poner freno a' venti ;
E venir presi volontari a i lidi
I pesci per suo amor ne l'acque ardenti ;
Et ubbidire a lui, quai servi fidi
Gli humani morbi, e gli huomini già spenti, *ecc.*

I, 87. Tornati, torna, sconsolato, indietro ;
Chiudi il tuo corpo, e la tua rotta fede
In qualche loco tenebroso e tetro,
Ove raggio del Sol luce non porga...

II, 40. Ch' io seguissi il Signor, quando correa
Dietro a l'orme sue sacre il mondo a gara ;
Ch' io l'adorassi, quand' ei vivi fea
I morti alzar da la funebre bara,
Non è gran fatto, a i segni ch' io vedea :
Ma 'l merito era, e l'opra via più cara,
Adorare il mio Cristo e seguir lui,
Quand' ei divenne preda e scherno altrui.

III, 39. O s' io non era dentro e sordo, e cieco,
Veder potea 'l mio mal, poteal' udire,
S' a mente ben, qual' era allor, mi reco,

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Me, like myselfe, a drowsie friend
He found,
Thrise, in His care, sleepe clos'd
my carelesse eye ;
Presage how Him my tongue should
thrise denie.

45. O bird !.....
.....
Be now the daily clocke to strike
the time,
When stinted eyes shall pay their
taske of teares...

L'aria del volto, e'l modo del
suo dire.
Quel dir turbato : 'Non potesti
meco
Vegghiar breve hora,' che volea
inferire ?
'Com' esser può, che 'n mio
favor tu mora,
Se vegghiar non puoi meco una
sol' hora ?'

I, 61. De la sua vita tutto il rimanente
Non fu mai notte, ch' ei non si
destasse,
Udendo il gallo, a dir quanto
fu iniquo,
Dando lagrime nove al fallo
antiquo.

In the sentence 'O women! woe to men...' (54) an allusion has been seen to the treacherous way in which the poet was taken prisoner (through Ann Belamy's information). But Tanzillo's IX, 90–91 had already anticipated the idea :

54. O women ! woe to men ; traps for
their falls ;
Still actors in all tragicall mis-
chances ;
Earth's necessarie evils, captiving
thralls,
Now murdring with your toungs,
now with your glances ;
Parents of life, and love, spoylers
of both,
The theeves of harts ; false do you
love or loth.

IX, 90. Potea quell' Angel reo.....
.....
Potea, dice, assaltarmi, e senz'
aiuto
Di femina entrar meco oggi in
battaglia ?
Senza il cui mezzo, raro s'è
veduto
Che tradimento ordisca, o ch'al-
tri assaglia.
Non potea certo, poiche da far
guerra
Non ha lega più fida in su la
terra.

91. ...tra noi (come per prova è
noto)
Ciò che la via di su fa che si
lasce,
Ciò che 'l mal reca, e ciò che
toglie il bene,
Senza mezzo di donna raro
avviene.

And the same biblical instances of woman's wickedness are given by both poets :

51. Can vertue, wisdome, strength, by
women spild
In David's, Salomon's, and Samson's
falls...

IX, 92. Con questa [i.e., la donna] il gran
Sanson fu vinto e domo,
.....
Con questa dal buon Re, sì
santo e pio,
Fè far ingiuria al mondo, ol-
traggio a Dio.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Stanza 55 and the following ones are to be compared with I, 53 etc.

55. In time, O Lord! Thine eyes with mine did meete,
In them I read the ruines of my fall;
Their chearing rayes, that made misfortune sweet,
Into my guiltie thoughts pourd floods of gall:
Their heavenly looks, that blest where they beheld,
Darts of disdaine and angrie checks did yeeld.

I, 55. ...in quel punto il miserabil vecchio
Ne gli occhi del Signor vide il suo fallo.
59. Chi ad una ad una raccontar potesse
Le parole di sdegno e d' amor piene
Che parve a Pietro di vedere impresse
Ne le sacrate due luci serene...

61. My frozen hart their sacred force did prove,
Which at their looks did yeeld like melting snowe.

I, 60. Come falda di neve, che agghiacciata
Il verno in chiusa valle ascosa giacque,
A primavera poi dal Sol scaldata
Tutta si sface, e si discioglie in acque:
Così la tema, che entro al cor gelata
Era di Pietro allor che 'l vero tacque,
Quando Cristo ver lui gli occhi rivolse
Tutta si sfece, e in pianto si risolse.

Stanza 62: 'O living mirrors...' echoes, as Father Thurston pointed out, I, 55: 'Giovane donna il suo bel volto in specchio...'; and 65: 'O eyes! whose glaunces are a silent speach...' is a counterpart of I, 57: 'Ogn' occhio del Signor lingua veloce...'; stanza 67 may as justly recall VI, 47–48; and 69, VI, 49.

74. Twise Moses' wand did strike the stubborne rock,
Ere stony veynes would yeeld their crystall blood;
Thine eyes' one looke serv'd as an onely knocke,
To make my hart gush out a weeping flood...

X, 38. Come sorger viv' onda, e molta, e fresca
Festi da dura, angusta, arida pietra,
Onde 'l gran popol ch' arde, si rinfresca,
E poca fè tanta mercè l'impetra:
Così (qual' io mi sia) fa, prego, ch' esca
Fuor di quest' occhi, che 'l dolor m' impetra,
Maggior fontana, ond' oggi io sfoghi e tempre
L' ardente sete, c' ho di pianger sempre.

92. But I, whose crime cuts off the least excuse,
A kingdome lost, but hop't no mite of gaine;

I, 70. O vita troppo rea, troppo fallace,
Che per fuggir qua giù sì breve guerra,

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

My highest marke was but the worthless use Of some few lingring howres of longer paine.	Perder m' hai fatto in Cielo eterna pace...
93 etc. Joy, infant saints, whom in the tender flower A happie storm did free from feare of sinne !	1, 75 etc. O quanto ponno al Ciel riferir lode Quei fanciulletti, che moriron santi, Quando la crudeltà del fiero Erode, Per ucciderne un sol, n' uccise tanti : Ch' inabili al mal fare, et a le frode Morir poteron, che peccare inanti...
94. Your downy heads, both pearles and rubies crowned.	77. E meritar ne la superna corte Prima corona haver, c' havesser chiome.
95. You bleating ewes, that wayle this wolvish spoyle Of sucking lambs new-bought with bitter throwes, T'imbalme your babes your eyes distill their oyle, Each hart to tombe her child wide rupture showes : Rue not their death, whom death did but revive, Yeeld ruth to me that liv'd to die alive.	80. Madri felici, che da' vostri petti Sveller vedeste i cari e dolci figli, Come da nido teneri augelletti, Qualhor son preda di rapaci artigli ; E sciolti da le fasce i pargoletti Membri del sangue lor farsi vermigli : Deh non piangete voi lor morte ria, Lasciate pianger me la vita mia.
100. Could I revived Lazarus behold, ... Would not astonisht dread my senses hold ? Ah yes ! my hart even with his naming, faints...	x, 50. Dovea tenermi [before my eyes] Lazaro in quell' atto, Che vivo il vidi dal sepolcro tratto. 51. O quanto haver di lui, poi c' ho fallito, Più che d' altri che sia, debbo vergogna, Nè in vau, credo, quel poco, c' ho dormito, L' anima trista di veder se 'l sogna Tal, qual' egli era, di sotterra uscito Ragionar meco, e darmi agra rampogna : Che non è sotto 'l Ciel huom, che più possa Farmi la guancia haver di scorno rossa.

From the foregoing it seems impossible not to believe that Southwell knew a good deal more of the Italian poem than the short fragment above referred to. The passages where that poem can be traced as the

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

source show acquaintance with at least seven of Tanzillo's Canti, namely, I–IV, IX–X, XV. A fact which can hardly be overlooked is that almost all the corresponding passages in the Italian poem consist of direct speeches by St Peter, whereas the narrative parts were either unknown or, more likely, utterly disregarded by the English poet. Now the *Lacrime di San Pietro* was well known: the poem was already widely circulating in the then extant form as early as August 1559, and publication was eagerly anticipated. Tanzillo himself, in a *Canzone escusatoria* to the Pope, said of his poem that

> A dotte orecchie e pie spesso udir piacque
> E molti oggi, del coro più fedele,
> Bramano ch'esca, e lor grava che 'l cele.

In ecclesiastical circles manuscript copies were going round. We are told of 'religious people who, having seen it in MS., had deemed it very praiseworthy owing to its theological argument as well as to its poetical form, and wished to get it so adapted as to be rendered "fit for the sight of the Holy Church."' Southwell went to Rome in 1578 and left on May 8th, 1586: in Rome he had conferred upon him the rather conspicuous post of Prefect of the Studies in the English College. Of course he came to know more of Tanzillo's poem than the fragment of it; but his translation can only have been done with the printed fragment before his eyes, or such a MS. as contained that part of the poem in that exact form. Before Southwell left Italy the first edition of the *Lacrime di San Pietro* had been edited in 1585 by G. B. Attendolo da Capua, and from 1587 onwards almost all the reprints of the poem were enriched with the *Lacrime di S. Maria Maddalena* of Erasmo da Valvasone, well known to students of Milton for his *Angeleida*. Southwell certainly knew the *Lacrime di S. Maria Maddalena* too, as his *Mary Magdalen's Funerall Tears* prove. But the *Lacrime di San Pietro* as it appears in all editions from 1585 to 1606 contains alterations and recasts, whereas Southwell knew the corresponding passages in their original form. For instance, Canto I, 55:

> Giovane donna il suo bel volto in specchio
> Non vide mai di lucido cristallo...

faithfully translated by Southwell as above, appears in the quoted editions as:

> Mai volto non si vide in alcun specchio
> Che sia di chiaro e lucido cristallo...

In those editions Tanzillo's poem is divided into thirteen *Pianti* instead of fifteen *Canti*: and probably from this comes the title of a work issued

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

in England in 1597, *Saint Peter's Ten Teares*, which however is rather reminiscent of Southwell's than of Tanzillo's poem.

When did Southwell translate the fragment of the *Lacrime* and compose his original poem? Dr Grosart's suggestion, that autobiographical experiences of prison-life had been worked into many of Southwell's poems, including the *Complaint* (he quotes as an instance the passage: 'Sleepe, Death's allye, oblivion of teares'), can hardly be accepted. Another fact, however, has been unanimously interpreted by critics of Southwell's work in such a way as to enable us to see in *St Peter's Complaint* a religious counterpart of Shakespeare's *Venus and Adonis*. 'There can be no doubt,' writes Mr H. H. Child, 'that Southwell had read Shakespeare's *Venus and Adonis* which was published in 1593. He seems indeed to have regarded it as the capital instance of the poetry he wished to supplant. *St Peter's Complaint* is written in the metre of Shakespeare's poem, and the preliminary address from the author to the reader contains a line

Still finest wits are 'stilling Venus' rose

which may be a direct reference to it.'

Now Southwell was committed to prison on June 20th, 1592: in any case there can have been no question of intellectual work on his part until he was transferred to a dungeon in the Tower of London, where he was confined for nearly three years. There he was supplied with the books he asked for, *which were only the Holy Bible and the works of St Bernard*[1]: in the letter Father Garnett wrote to the General of the Society of Jesus in Rome on the day after Southwell's execution, we read that: 'He had been kept for nearly three years in closer custody than anyone ever was, so that no Catholic ever saw him or spoke to him. He was often tortured and that in a more cruel manner than ever this barbarity is accustomed to inflict. He publicly declared that he had been tortured ten times, and that with torments worse than the rack or than death itself.' In such circumstances it may be doubted whether he could attend to any literary work at all: but still more improbable is the hypothesis that he could get hold of a copy of *Venus and Adonis* (publ. about April 1593), if even we allow—which is yet a gratuitous admission—that he was supplied with more books than the two above referred to. If he applied for more books, it can hardly have been but for religious ones. And this too is very improbable, as 'For all this long time he could neither say Mass, nor go to the Sacrament of Penance, nor speak with any one, nor receive consolation from any.' It would

[1] Challoner's *Memoirs of Missionary Priests*, 1, p. 325, ed. 1741.

Digitized by Google

Original from
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

seem rather preposterous that anyone in such a plight should be supplied with nothing less than the latest literary success. Dungeons and torture-chambers do not usually teem with customers for poetry-bookshops; neither had Southwell's prison any resemblance with Leigh Hunt's bower in Surrey gaol. We are by no means bound to see an allusion to Shakespeare's poem in the passage *To the Reader*. We must not forget that the Venus and Adonis story was a popular theme of those years[1], if we must see a particular hint in Southwell's verses. But first, is it quite certain that we have to do with a particular allusion to such a story, or is it not simpler to see in the passage nothing more than what its words import, that is an antithesis between Christ's thorn and Venus' rose, where Venus' *rose*, as a similitude of the Erotic Muse in general seems naturally suggested as a counterpart of Christ's *thorn*, this latter concept being elicited by the main current of the ideas[1]? As to the metrical form, it was no more peculiar to Shakespeare than to anybody else: 'His [Shakespeare's] metre is the best proof of his susceptibility to current vogue. He employed the sixain or six-line stanza rhyming *ababcc* which is the commonest of all forms of narrative verse in both English and French poetry of the sixteenth century[2].' But even if those prefatory verses contained an allusion to Shakespeare's *Venus and Adonis*, it remains to be proved that Southwell's poem was composed after the Preface and not, as would be natural, before it. Briefly, there is no proof at all that *St Peter's Complaint* was written in prison: on the contrary it would be rather strange if it had not been written beforehand. May not the translation of Tanzillo's *Lacrime* have been attempted by the poet soon or shortly after his first acquaintance with that poem? The fact that it closely follows the text of the Italian fragment seems rather to point out that such was the case. After 1585 the whole of Tanzillo's poem—although in a mangled form—was in print, and Southwell's attempt is rather to be relegated to a period when only MS. copies and fragments of the *Lacrime* were available. Moreover, Southwell's manner of life in Rome was far more favourable to literary work than the stormy period of his English mission. There is a whole group of Southwell's lyrics—that part of the *Maeoniae* which deals with Our Lord's and Our Lady's lives[3]—whose rich and gorgeous character strangely contrasts with the more subdued and homely vein of the

[1] As a matter of fact the antithesis is one likely to suggest itself obviously to a religious poet. See also Crashaw's *Epigrammata Sacra*, 'Lectori,' chiefly l. 83 foll. (ed. Waller, p. 11).

[2] Sir Sidney Lee's *Life of Shakespeare*, p. 144, ed. 1922.

[3] In Grosart's edition, pp. 116–144.

Digitized by Google Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

hymns. Some of those lyrics, as *The Flight into Egypt* and *Christ's Bloody Sweate* seem actually to anticipate Crashaw, owing to the influence of contemporary Italian poetry. It is curious to notice how both those English Catholic poets made quite good poems out of clumsy so-called religious Italian verse. Nobody would think very highly of Marino's *Strage degli Innocenti*, but Crashaw's translation of the *Sospetto d' Erode* is something of a masterpiece. *St Peter's Complaint* offers a similar instance. Tanzillo, in a passage of his poem, says, addressing St Peter:

> E 'l tuo dolor.....
> .....al mondo farò noto
> Con stil di fede pieno e d' arte voto;

which is true only for the second part, as the poem is a failure both from the religious and from the artistic point of view. But Southwell's *Complaint*, notwithstanding all its defects, leaves an impression of earnest religion and, in many places, of high lyrical inspiration.

MARIO PRAZ.

LIVERPOOL.

Digitized by Google

Original from
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

A PROPOSAL FOR AN ENGLISH ACADEMY IN 1660.

WHEN the British Academy received its charter in 1902, an idea was at length realized that had been in men's minds in different forms from the sixteenth century. Some scholars had desired public recognition for an academy that would conserve antiquities and promote the study of history and archaeology. Others had desired royal patronage for an academy that would standardize orthography and literary usage and encourage research in the several branches of philology. And others had desired official sanction for an academy that would be a licenser of books and a final court of appeal for all questions both of literary form and of literary matter.

The British Academy of to-day has for its object 'the promotion of study of the moral and political sciences, including history, philosophy, law, politics and economics, archaeology, and philology.' This paper deals with a proposal made in 1660 to establish an academy whose duty would be to reform errors in books and then to license them, and to improve the English language by regulating usage, translating foreign books, and compiling dictionaries. Before I touch however on my special subject I must remind the reader of the salient facts on which various critics have laid varying stress, in connexion with the early attempts at founding an academy.

Archbishop Parker founded a Society of Antiquaries in 1572. I have not seen evidence to confirm Mr Monroe's statement that it was chartered in 1589 by Queen Elizabeth as 'An Academy of the Studye of Antiquity and History[1].' But it operated for some years, as is shown by various evidences. According to the account of the origin and establishment of this Society in *Archæologia*, vol. I, 1770, the Society was dissolved, probably in 1604, by James I. Miss E. M. Portal says the original Society of Antiquaries had failed to obtain a charter from Queen Elizabeth, and the Society held its last meeting in 1614[2]. The first purpose of this Society was the preservation of history and antiquities, but in the original proposal there was also included the study of modern languages and the history and interests of neighbour states. A letter of April, 1605, from Richard Carew, then in Cornwall, to Sir Robert Cotton

[1] Monroe, B. S., *Modern Philology*, vol. VIII, July 1910.
[2] Portal, E. M., *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 1915–16.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

suggests that the Society of Antiquaries was still existent but not flourishing.

Sir, I praie you geeve me leave to impart unto you my greeff, that my so remote dwelling depriveth mee of your sweete and respected Antiquarum society, into which your kyndenesse towardes mee and grace with them made mee an Entrance, and unto which (notwithstanding so long discontynuance) my longing desire layeth a Contynuall clayme.

I hearde by my Brother, that in the late Queenes tyme it was lykelie to have received an establishment and extraordynarie favour from sundrie great personages; and me thinckes that under so learned a King this plant should rather grow to his full height, then quaille in the Springe. It imports no little disgrace to our Nation, that others have so many Academyes, and wee none at all, especially seeing wee want not choice of wyttes every waye matcheable with theirs, both for number and sufficyency. Sutch a worke is worthie of your solicitation and indevour, and yow owe yt to your owne fame, and the good of your Countrey; but of this inough...[1].

That literature and language, as such, were not of much, if any, concern to this Society, is indicated by the fact that Gabriel Harvey, in a letter to Edmund Spenser in 1580, said that he had little hope for the English language until its orthography was standardized either 'by a generall Counsel or acte of Parliament[2].'

When the establishment of an academy was next urged, this time by some of the members of the defunct Society of Antiquaries, the purpose of the organization had been broadened to include the cultivation of the language. Edmund Bolton, the author of *Hypercritica*, was the leading agent in this project. As proposed to the King by him, the task of the Academy would be (1) to supervise the translation of foreign secular books into English[3], (2) to direct study and careful writing to the story of British History, and (3) to keep a constant register of public facts. Between 1617 and 1626, Bolton made earnest efforts to gain the active interest of the Court in the establishment of this Academy[4]. By 1625, he had won the favour of many literary men and of Buckingham

[1] *Original Letters of Eminent Literary Men*, ed. Sir Henry Ellis. Printed for the Camden Society, London, 1843.

[2] Haslewood, J., *Ancient Critical Essays upon English Poets and Poesy*, London, 1812–15.

[3] Mr Monroe says that this Society, 'so far as concerned literature, was to pass upon matter rather than manner.' Bolton's words indicate, it seems to me, that the Society had in mind to regulate language too. 'When among the many public services of the main body of the Academy, consisting only of *Essentials*, the superintending of the review, or the review itself, of all English translations of secular learning, (one of the which, being of an author of high account and sovereign use, his Majesty named with much dislike), that good books might be sincerely turned out of foreign tongues into ours, was propounded, his Majesty did assent thereunto, gladly acknowledging that false weights and measures in words were as diligently to be discovered and as equally to be detected as in wares, and rather by so much more as things intellectual are more excellent than things palpable or corporal; and did also add of his own accord, that it should be theirs to authorise all books and writings which were to go forth in print which did not *ex professo* handle theological arguments; and to give to the vulgar people indexes expurgatory and expunctory upon all books of secular learning printed in English never otherwise to be public again.'

[4] A full account of Bolton's efforts is given by J. M. Hunter in *Archæologia*, XXXII, 1847, and by E. M. Portal in *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 1915–16.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

and of King James. But James died and Charles had little sympathy with the proposal. The Academy therefore failed of definite establishment[1].

Richelieu formally established the French Academy in 1635. In 1650 James Howell wrote:

> The new Academy of Wits call'd L'Academie de beaux esprits, which the late cardinal Richelieu founded in Paris, is now in hand to reform the French language in this particular [viz. in orthography], and to weed it of superfluous Letters; which makes the Tongue differ so much from the Pen...[2].

Simultaneously with these efforts, there was a developing interest in the idea of a scientific society which was initiated by Bacon's *New Atlantis* in 1627 and culminated in the Royal Society in 1662.

The history of the academy idea in the first half of the seventeenth century I believe has in it no matter of dispute. The history of the idea after 1650 is controverted by the critics. The ordinary view has been restated and a new view advanced in a paper recently communicated to the British Academy by Professor O. F. Emerson[3]. Near the beginning of his paper, Professor Emerson says:

> Thus, the first proposal in the second half of the seventeenth century has always been associated with the appointment of a committee by the Royal Society in 1664, while another, sometimes placed in the same decade, has been attributed exclusively to the Earl of Roscommon. Unquestionably the first, and probably the second, as I shall hope to show, is to be more directly attributed to one of the greatest men in the English literature of the period, the poet, dramatist, miscellaneous essayist John Dryden.

After surveying all the evidence of various other critics and making careful inquiry into nice facts and dates, Professor Emerson concludes:

> And it is but a tardy act of justice to the memory of that great poet that we to-day recognize the renewed advocacy of a British Academy at this time as initiated by Dryden himself, rather than by any other, and that we accord to him the praise of an exalted conception, even though it was to be unfulfilled for many years.

I believe that two pieces of evidence, hitherto unnoticed by the students of this question serve to negate Professor Emerson's conclusion which gives so much credit to Dryden, and to make it seem highly probable that the idea of a literary academy was of somewhat general interest in Dryden's time.

Dryden's first public advocacy of a literary academy, which was made in the Dedication of the *Rival Ladies*, by the most favourable dating that is possible, cannot have been earlier than June 1664. Dryden

[1] Elias Ashmole makes this entry in his diary in 1659: 'July 2. Was the Antiquaries feast.'

[2] Howell, *Familiar Letters* (ed. Jacobs, 1892), p. 510.

[3] 'John Dryden and the British Academy,' *Proceedings*, vol. x, 1921.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

questions if he has been as careful as he ought with the language of the play, and then adds:

> I am sorry that, speaking so noble a language as we do, we have not a more certain Measure of it, as they have in France: when they have an 'Academy' erected for that purpose, and endowed with large privileges by the present King.

Six months later, on December 7, 1664, the Royal Society moved to undertake, through a Committee of its own members, the work done by the Academy in France. The vote of the Society as recorded in Birch's *History of the Royal Society* (I, p. 499) reads in part:

> It being suggested that there were persons of the Society whose genius was very proper and inclined to improve the English tongue, particularly for philosophic purposes, it was voted that there should be a committee for improving the English language; and that they meet at Sir Peter Wyche's lodgings in Gray's-Inn once or twice a month, and give an account of their proceedings, when called upon.

Birch is the only historian of the Royal Society that mentions this action by the Society[1]. Sprat, Weld, and Thomson say nothing of it. Sprat not only passes it over in silence but himself outlines a proposal for an academy and then apologizes for transgressing his subject:

> But I see, I have already transgress'd: For I know it will be thought unadvisedly done, while I was inforcing a Weightier Design, to start, and to follow another of less moment. I shall therefore let it pass as an extravagant conceit: Only I shall affirm, that the *Royal Society* is so far from being like to put a stop to such business, that I know many of its Members, who are as able as any others, to assist in the bringing of it into practice.
>
> Thus I have dispatch'd my first general Head; in which it may be, it was not needful to have stay'd so long: Seeing I am confident, I have said nothing, but what was before very well known, and what passes about in common discourse.

Dryden, who was on this committee appointed by the Society, had been made a member of the Royal Society in 1662 and, in Professor Emerson's judgment, he was the only working member of the committee who had the genius 'very proper and inclined' to the subject of the vote.

From these facts Professor Emerson thinks it reasonable to conclude:

> It may be, therefore, that he was the first to mention, in conversation with his fellow members, the idea of a British Academy. At least the language of the Society's vote, considering Dryden's advocacy already published, may indicate that Dryden was partly in mind in appointing the committee.

Although our earliest edition of Sprat's *History* is of 1667, Professor Emerson deduces good reason to believe that the part of the book which contains Sprat's digression to urge the founding of an academy for

[1] But Robert Hooke, who was made a fellow of the Royal Society on June 3, 1663, left documents in his own handwriting dated 1663 [cf. Add. MSS. Brit. Mus. 4441] in which he says: 'The business and design of the Royal Society is...To improve the knowledge of naturall things and all useful Arts, Manufacturies, Mechanick practices, Engynes and Inventions by Experiments...(not meddling with Divinity, Metaphysics, Moralls, Politicks, Grammar, Rhetorick, or Logick).' There is no evidence whether this is a private view of Hooke's or one shared by his associates of the Society.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

England was written before December 1664. This would account for Sprat's omission of any mention of the action by the Society and would make consistent his other comment in the early part of the book that the Royal Society have put

> in execution, the only Remedy, that can be found for this extravagance: and that has been, a constant Resolution, to reject all the amplifications, digressions, and swellings of style.... They have exacted from their members a close, naked, and natural way of speaking...preferring the language of Artisans, Countrymen, and Merchants, before that of Wits, or Scholars.

Professor Emerson surmises further about Sprat:

> In all probability, also, he was encouraged to make his recommendation by the public advocacy of Dryden.

But if Dryden's public advocacy of the academy idea was the first advocacy of it and was published at most a month or two before Sprat wrote, why should Sprat, after developing it more or less as his own, throw off the matter with an apology for having 'stay'd so long with an extravagant conceit' and with 'what was before very well known and what passes about in common discourse'?

A piece of evidence, hitherto overlooked, strengthens the belief that an academy to improve the language was not a new idea of Dryden's in 1664 but was a subject of general discussion several years before Dryden proposed it.

In September 1660 there was 'Printed for John Crooke at the Signe of the Ship in St. Paul's Churchyard' a book entitled

> *New Atlantis*, Begun by the Lord Verulam, Viscount St. Albans: and Continued by R. H. Esquire. Wherein is set forth A Platform of Monarchical Government with A Pleasant intermixture of divers rare Inventions, and wholsom Customs, fit to be introduced into all Kingdoms, States, and Commonwealths.

At the end of the dedicatory address to King Charles II the author signs himself

> Your Majesty's most Faithful and most humbly devoted Servant in the strictest ties of Duty and Allegiance R. H.

There is definite matter in this work about an academy for improving the English language.

The author is describing in the form of a continuation of Bacon's *New Atlantis* such an ideal state as the restored King Charles could make in England. Among his definite proposals are these:

> We have one in the chief University called *Historiographus Regius*, who hath a great pension allowed him for supervising all History that shall be put out. For if they do not set forth the truth exactly, clearly, faithfully, concisely neither by omitting anything through ignorance, or forgetfulness, his province is to correct the History: that posterity may judge right of all praeceeding actions, and not be wronged by any sinister practices, or false glosses.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

We have besides these in the Imperial City one Emminent *Academy* of selected wits: whose endeavours are to reform all errors in books, and then to licence them; to purifie our Native Language from Barbarism or Solecism, to the height of Eloquence, by regulating the termes and phrases thereof into constant use of the most significant words, proverbs, and phrases, and justly appropriating them either to the Lofty, mean, or Comic stile. These likewise translate the best Authors, and render them in their genuine sense to us very perspicuous: and make Dictionaries in all languages, wherein the proper terms of art for every notion and thing in every trade, manufacture and science is genuinely rendered and with its derivation very perspicuous.

We have also in each of the provinciall Cities (which have Universities) Free Schools for the attaining of the Languages, Singing, Dancing, Fencing, Riding, and writing, either by *Brachugraphy*, *Hieroglyphic*, or an Instrument we have made to write two copies at once, at one and the same motion, for dispatch. For all which we have public Governours and Masters sit for each place respectively; chosen by the representative body of that *Academie* every three years. (pp. 42–44.)

Later in the book, the visitors to Bensalem are being shown over the royal city and this time see the seat of the Academy:

Having viewed this [the Court of Virtue] well, we pass through a stately Hall into the Academy itself, to which it belonged. The Quadrangle was environed on three sides with fair Cloisters, the Pillars, and Arches being of Mosaic, of Gold and azure and other curious colours, like that of *Amaroduc* at *Fesse* in *Barbary*. This is that Eminent Academy (said he) placed here in this glorious Center for the concourse of all the prime selected Wits throughout the Nation, where they translate, write, Licence books, correct others, and purifie the native Language to the highest pitch of elegance. Right against the Hall the Library ranges, which was large and magnificent. Underneath we passed into the fifth court, called the Court of Orpheus. (p. 92.)

This, in 1660, is a more definite proposal for the function of an academy than Dryden makes in 1664[1]. Most, if not all, of the other ideas in the book are to be found in the familiar literature of 1660 and before. In the Preface the author says the proposals he is to make are not new:

...supposing the ground work *Monarchicall Government* (as thus laid) the most perfect and surest foundation to build on.... My present design is to point out such wholesome laws as may make that government most happy and flourishing.

(For here are no new ones introduced, such I mean as were never heard of or used anywhere: This being a collection or reviving of many wholesome edicts and customs formerly used or still in being, at least most of them in some places or other of the world and thought most convenient joyntly to uphold this or any other Monarchical Island government.)

It is quite possible that the English translation of Pelisson's[2] *History of the French Academy* in 1657 either renewed or marked the renewal of interest in the idea of an English academy. The translator of it, H. S. [Henry Some] indicated in his Preface that he expected the translation to be of considerable interest to his countrymen. R. H. himself may have read at least a part of the book closely. Monsieur de Serizan,

[1] Dryden's first clear expression of what he thought the function of an academy is in the Dedication of the *Troilus and Cressida* (1679).

[2] Pelisson appears in the B.M. Catalogue as 'Pellisson-Fontanier.'

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

in his letter written for the Academy, had proposed to Cardinal Richelieu the functions of the French Academy in these words (translation of 1657):

> As for their Functions, which was the second thing they promised to treat of: That they should be, the purifying of the language from the filth it had contracted.... That to this end 'twere fit to retaine some of those which are now in use so that they may be refer'd to one of the three kinds of writings, in which they might be used; that those, for instance, which are naught in a lofty, might be borne with in a mean, and approved of in the lowest and Comique style.... (p. 17.)

Later,

> In the 2nd Assembly upon the question that was propounded concerning its Function, Monsieur Chapelain declared that in his opinion it ought to be, To endeavour the Purifying of our Language; and the rendering it capable of the highest Eloquence (as you saw 'twas said in the Project). That to this purpose they are in the first place to regulate the Termes and Phrases, by a large Dictionary, and a very exact Grammar which might give it a part of those Ornaments it wants, and that afterwards it might acquire the rest by a Rhetorique and a Poetique, which should be composed to serve as a rule to them that would write in verse and in prose.... (p. 23.)

The occurrence of the markedly parallel phrases 'the height of Eloquence,' 'regulating the termes and phrases,' 'the Lofty, mean, or Comic stile,' 'purifie the native Language,' in R. H.'s proposal argues for his knowledge of the story of the French Academy[1].

The identity of R. H. Esquire has never been established. When Tenison, in 1679, collected and published *Baconiana*, he was unable to name the author of *New Atlantis Continued*.

> This Supplement [to the unfinished *New Atlantis*] has been made by another Hand*: A great and hardy Adventure, to finish a Piece after the Lord *Verulam's* Pencil.
>
> * See R. H. *contin.* of N. Atlantis Octo. Lon. 1660.

(p. 36, *Baconiana*.)

There is a cumulation of circumstantial evidence that points to Robert Hooke as a likely author of the book. The *New Atlantis Continued* betrays an obvious enthusiasm for co-operation in scientific and literary effort. It proposes both a scientific society and a literary academy. R. H. has the guide to his perfect city explain to the visitors:

> We have great encouragements for all ingenious persons, and give great honour and reverence as well as large rewards, to the Authors of all new and good Treatises, whether Divine or humane, of all artificial inventions, discourses of new Countrys, Minerals, Earths, Waters, or whatsoever else is useful to mankind, either at home by rewarding them with great Pensions, or from abroad by erecting their statues.
>
> We study the publick good so much, that whereas we reward those who discover, so he is in some measure punished that conceals and hides a benefit which may pleasure his countrey: For they that do no good when they can, as well as they that do mischief are here accounted debtors alike, and are looked on as unnatural children to their Common parent their Country. (pp. 52, 53.)

[1] The English proposal goes farther than the French one in suggesting that the academy be empowered to license all books. Bolton's proposals for 'The Academy Royal of King James I' had contained the same suggestion.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

To accord with this we have a record of Robert Hooke's enthusiasm for the same ends and the same methods. In the Preface to Robert Knox's *An Historical Relation of the Island Ceylon* (1681), Hooke proposes to increase English knowledge of foreign countries by providing against knowledge being lost.

> The principal Causes [of losses of knowledge in the past] I conceive may be these; First, The want of sufficient Instructions (to Seamen and Travellers,) to show them what is pertinent and considerable, to be observ'd in their Voyages and Abodes, and how to make their Observations and keep Registers or Accounts of them.
>
> Next, The want of some Publick Incouragement for such as shall perform such Instructions.
>
> Thirdly, The want of fit Persons both to Promote and Disperse such Instructions to Persons fitted to engage, and careful to Collect Returns; and Compose them into Histories; by examining the Persons more at large upon those and other Particulars. And by separating what is pertinent from what is not so, and to be Rejected; who should have also wherewith to gratifie every one according to his Performances.
>
> Fourthly, The want of some easie Way to have all such Printed: First singly, and afterwards divers of them together. It having been found that many small Tracts are lost after Printing, as well as many that are never Printed; upon which account we are much obliged to Mr. *Haclute* and Mr. *Purchas*, for preserving many such in their Works.
>
> Fifthly, The want of taking care to Collect all such Relations of Voyages and Accounts of Countries as have been Published in other Languages, and Translating them either into *English*, or (which will be of more general use) into *Latin*, the learned Language of *Europe*. There being many such in other Countries hardly ever heard of in *England*.
>
> The Difficulties of removing which Defecte is not so great but that it might easily fall even within the compass of a private Ability to remove, if at least Publick Authority would Countenance the Design, how much less then would it be if the same would afford also some moderate Encouragement and Reward?
>
> The Royal Society of London for Improving Natural Knowledge, has not been wanting in preparing and dispersing Instructions to the end, and is ready still to promote it, if the Publick would allow a Recompence to the Undertakers. The desirableness and facility of this Undertaking may, I hope, in a short time produce the Expedients also. In the interim all means should be used, to try what may be obtain'd from the Generosity of such as have had the Opportunities of Knowing Foreign Countries.

Hooke's biographer, Richard Waller, says further of him:

> He was in the beginning of his being made known to the Learned, very communicative of his Philosophical Discoveries and Inventions, till some Accidents made him to a Crime close and reserv'd.... I indeed, as well as others, have heard him declare sometimes that he had a great Project in his Head as to the Disposal of the most part of his Estate for the advancement of Natural Knowledge, and to promote the Ends and Designs for which the Royal Society was instituted: To build an handsome Fabrick for the *Societies* use, with a Library, Repository, Laboratory, and other Conveniences for making Experiments, and to found and endow a perpetual Mechanick Lecture of the Nature of what himself read...[1].

R. H. held Bacon in high reverence. The *New Atlantis Continued* pays homage both to the person of Bacon and to his scientific methods.

[1] 'The life of Dr. Robert Hooke' in *The Posthumous Works of Robert Hooke*, London, 1705, p. xxvii.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Robert Hooke likewise, in an undated essay 'A General Scheme, or Idea of the Present State of Natural Philosophy,' pays full respect to Bacon.

> Some other Course therefore must be taken to promote the search of knowledge. Some other kind of Art for Inquiry than what hath been hitherto made use of, must be discovered; the Intellect is not to be suffer'd to act without its Help, but is continually to be assisted by some Method or Engine, which shall be as a Guide to regulate its Actions, so as that it shall not be able to act amiss: Of this Engine, no *Man* except the incomparable *Verulam*, hath had any thoughts, and he indeed hath promoted it to a very good pitch; but there is yet somewhat to be added, which he seem'd to want time to compleat...[1].

Hooke, according to Waller,

> Never made any considerable discovery in Nature, invented any useful Contrivance, or found out any difficult Problem, without setting down his Acknowledgement to the Omnipotent Providence, as many places in his Diary testify...[2].

The same gratitude to the Deity is conspicuous in the work of R. H. Religious rites enclose the life of the Island of Bensalem. When Verdugo, an inventor, was publicly rewarded for a discovery one of the 'most eloquent Brethren' gave

> great thanks to Verdugo, and Praises to God the enleightner of our understandings, and sole Author and Giver of all good things.

If these indecisive evidences suggest that Robert Hooke is the author of the *New Atlantis Continued*, the circumstances of Hooke's life in 1660 fit the suggestion. He was then at Oxford as a scientific lecturer and was intimately acquainted with the scholars there who were soon to be the founders of the Royal Society. His first known published work was a pamphlet on capillary attraction in 1661. His youth would have protected his anonymous authorship of *New Atlantis Continued* from a bibliographer like Tenison. In other works Hooke signed himself merely R. H. The book, with its very detailed knowledge of scientific things, its enthusiasm for extensive organization of all provinces of life and intellectual activity by the state, its innocent faith in the rôle that King Charles might play in making a veritable New Atlantis of England, is easily the thing we might expect from the youth of twenty-five, with scientific interests and indefatigable genius, that Hooke was in 1660.

The intellectual interests of the *New Atlantis Continued* at first may seem wide for Robert Hooke, the young scientist. But this hardly remains an objection when we note that most of the book is lacking in originality. Sir Thomas More and Francis Bacon have been heavily relied on for literary methods and for social ideas. With the exception of the central scientific interests of the work, most of the matter that

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 6.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. xxviii.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

was not commonplace in 1660 is lacking in any quality of penetration. Also if we read the Preface that Hooke wrote in 1681 to Robert Knox's *An Historical Relation etc.*, we see that his was a mind that easily ran out to the appreciation of things other than scientific.

If Hooke was the author of the *New Atlantis Continued* then the likelihood is the stronger that the literary academy idea was in common discourse as early as 1660. For Hooke, so far as we know, had no particular interest in literature, and it is not likely that the idea was original with him, or he would have been made a member of the Royal Society's committee to further the development of it. It is possible that the author had by chance heard of the translation of Pelisson's book and from it had drawn the idea of an academy in which neither he nor his countrymen had any real interest. But this is so improbable that I think it may be concluded, whoever R. H. was, that Dryden was not the first after the Restoration to advocate an academy for England.

Perhaps the earlier proposal ought not to lessen the honour that Professor Emerson has ascribed to Dryden. It may be that he was 'the only man of his time to take a life-long interest in the idea,' though it seems there is little actual evidence that Dryden was alone in cherishing the idea or that he made any use of the opportunity that the Royal Society's interest in the idea afforded him[1].

EDMUND FREEMAN.

MISSOULA, MONTANA, U.S.A.

[1] The further history of the interest in an academy has been traced by Professor Emerson, and by Professor B. S. Monroe in *Modern Philology*, vol. VIII, July 1910.

Digitized by Google

Original from
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

THE RELATION OF THE OLDEST BRANCH OF THE 'ROMAN DE RENART' TO THE TRISTAN POEMS.

THE student of the *Roman de Renart* cannot fail to be struck by its lack of unity; the branches are not knit together to form a single and coherent romance as the title appears to suggest, but are merely a collection of miscellaneous episodes. There is, however, convincing evidence that Branches II and V*a* are closely related in both subject-matter and treatment, and M. Foulet's theory that they are the work of one author and were intended to form a single poem has been generally accepted[1]. This poem (II + V*a*), ascribed by M. Foulet to the date 1176–7 (on the strength of the allusions which it contains to the Papal Legate, Peter of Pavia), is the oldest part of the work; its author was, in all probability, the Pierre de Saint-Cloud mentioned in other Branches. In his prologue the poet enumerates some of the types of literature that had previously interested his public, and declares his intention of introducing a new kind of story:

Seigneurs, oï avez maint conte
Que maint conterre vous raconte,
Conment Paris ravi Elaine,
Le mal qu'il en ot et la paine,
De Tristan dont La Chievre fist[2],
Qui assez bellement en dist,
Et fabliaus et chançon de geste,
Romanz de lui et de la beste[3],
Maint autre conte par la terre.
Mais onques n'oïstes la guerre,
Qui tant fu dure de grant fin,
Entre Renart et Ysengrin,
Qui moult dura et moult fu dure.

That he should have specifically mentioned, along with the story 'Conment Paris ravi Elaine,' the 'Tristan dont La Chievre fist' is particularly worthy of note; the reader is tempted to enquire at the outset whether the poet had any underlying purpose in thus singling out one work from the mass of stories familiar to his audience. If La Chievre's poem were extant to-day, it would be most interesting to

[1] L. Foulet, *Le Roman de Renard*, Paris, 1914, *passim*. This theory has been controverted by W. Suchier in *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen*, vol. CXLIII, pp. 149 and 223, but his arguments are unconvincing.

[2] So MS. B; Martin, following MS. D, reads 'De Tristan *qui* la chievre fist'; Foulet (p. 67) has 'De Tristan *que* La Chievre fist.'

[3] The correct reading of this verse is doubtful; cf. Foulet, p. 141.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

compare it with Pierre de Saint-Cloud's work and to try to discover what that purpose was; in its absence the only alternative is to utilize one of the versions of the Tristan legend which have come down to us. For reasons which will be obvious, the most appropriate for the purposes of the comparison is the version of Beroul.

In the first place the reader will not fail to note the affinity between the stories related by Pierre de Saint-Cloud and Beroul. When stripped of minor episodes, each of these may be said to consist of two parts, of which the second forms the sequel to the first. In the first part the story tells of the unlawful love between a personage of high rank and the wife of another; an outrage is committed and its discovery gives rise to a private feud. In the sequel a public 'escondit' of the crime is arranged and the accused emerge successfully from the ordeal. In the Tristan story, Tristan himself and Iseult are the offenders and Mark the aggrieved; their counterparts in the beast epic are Renart and Hersent on the one hand and Ysengrin on the other. A closer examination will reveal a striking similarity in their characters. Tristan and Renart have obvious points of resemblance; they are very much alike in their lack of fear and love of adventure, and, above all, in their adroitness. Many episodes depict Tristan as resourceful and fearless and well-versed in the art of cunning; his escapades at the Mal Pas, his disguises, and the famous leap from the chapel window are typical instances. Beroul himself, in a reference to the *Roman de Renart*, gives further evidence of this:

Tristan set mot de Malpertuis. (Beroul, v. 4286.)

He thus intentionally likens him to Renart

qui tant sot toz jors de guile. (Br. II, v. 25.)

It is very tempting to ask whether the place-names 'Malpas' and 'Malpertuis' are not themselves related; it is in Br. V*a* (vv. 954 and 1272) that the latter name occurs, whilst in Br. II (v. 1249) the name 'Valcrues' is used. May we not here have a clue to the origin of the name 'Malpertuis'?

The characters of Mark and Ysengrin are in sharp contrast to those of the offenders. Both are impulsive, irascible, and entirely lacking in the more subtle qualities referred to above. Iseult and Hersent, too, bear an obvious resemblance. When charged by their husbands with infidelity and complicity in the outrage, they protest their innocence and are successful in appeasing them. The passages in which they offer to exculpate themselves by the oath of compurgation or trial by ordeal are strikingly reminiscent of one another:

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Se il vuelent avoir ma jure
Ou s'il volent loi de juïse,
Ja n'en voudront si roide guise
(Metent le terme) que ne face. (Beroul, vv. 3244–7.)

Que se me lessiez escondire
Par serement ne par joïse,
Jel feroie par tel devise
C'on me feïst ardoir ou pendre,
Se ne m'en pooie desfendre. (*Renart*, Br. II, vv. 1196–1200.)

In the actual 'escondit' scene which follows (in spite of the fact that Renart, not Hersent, is called upon to take the oath) the affinity of the two poems is equally noteworthy. The quarrel has been transferred to the jurisdiction of a higher court, and King Noble, the lion, and King Arthur make their appearance. The picture of the all-powerful king seated in the midst of his vassals is not an unfamiliar one to readers of the 'romans bretons,' but here even the verbal agreement is striking:

Sa mesnie sit environ. (Beroul, v. 3385.)
Sa mesnie qui l'avirone. (*Renart*, V*a*, v. 308.)

The parallel between Noble and Arthur is a fairly obvious one. In the proceedings that follow, each of them strives to maintain strict impartiality but cannot help betraying his sympathy with and even leniency towards the accused. In the oath-scene Iseult is summoned to make her 'escondit' over the Cornish relics, Renart over the body of 'Saint' Roenel, the dog. In each case the 'relics' are displayed in the open field, with the barons ranged on either side, silently awaiting the appearance of those who have been invited to step forward and take their oath (*Renart*, V*a*, vv. 1091 ff.; Beroul, vv. 4125 ff. and 4183 ff.). In neither case, however, is a straightforward oath forthcoming; Iseult escapes by a ruse, Renart by sudden flight, and the designs of their enemies are completely frustrated.

If there is a close parallel between the stories themselves, there is no less similarity in their setting. The narratives, alternating between town and open country, court and forest, contain many descriptions which are strikingly reminiscent of one another. The following parallels are amongst the most obvious:

Li criz live par la cité. (Beroul, v. 827.)
Live la noise et le bruit. (Beroul, v. 860.)

and

Lievent la noise par la ville. (*Renart*, V*a*, v. 663.)

Laissent le chien, tornent arire.
Husdent aqeut une chariere. (Beroul, vv. 1527–8; cf. 1685–6.)

and

Recraant s'en tornent arere.
Renars tote une grant charrere
S'en vait fuiant.... (*Renart*, II, vv. 831–3; cf. 1373–4.)

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

The similarity in the style of the poets is no less striking; the use of the rhetorical question, or of the aside in which the author's personal opinion intrudes itself, is constantly recurring; and in both works the truth of the story is corroborated by reference to the 'estoire':

> N'en sevent mie bien *l'estoire*.
> Berox l'a mex en sen memoire. (Beroul, vv. 1267–8.)

and

> Trover le poëz en *l'estoire*. (*Renart*, II, v. 134.)

One is tempted to ask whether the Renart poet is not using the word 'estoire' ironically.

To suggest some explanation for the affinity of the two works is not altogether easy. The outrage episode appears to be based on a fable, extant only in the Fables of Marie de France (ed. Warnke, no. LXIX), but translated by her from an English collection, which was itself adapted from a Latin *Romulus*. The story as related by Marie de France is much simpler than in Branches II + V*a*; it is the she-bear and not the she-wolf that suffers the outrage; on pursuing the fox in order to drive him away, she gets caught in the bushes and is violated by him. In the *Ysengrimus*, written 1152, the story already appears in a much elaborated form. Pierre de Saint-Cloud, who derived the episode (according to Foulet) from the *Ysengrimus*, has developed it into a dramatic story of which, as we have seen, the theme, characters, and setting are reminiscent of Beroul. The most significant of his additions are the offer of trial by ordeal, the complicity of Hersent and, especially, the public 'escondit.' That this 'escondit' scene should have been made the sequel of a 'viol' episode is especially interesting. Gaston Paris, discussing the 'escondit' scene of the *Roman de Renart*, says that the episode 'ne doit rien à aucune source populaire ou littéraire,' and continues: 'On a évidemment ici une *invention* d'un conteur français du xii^e^ siècle: c'est une parodie, faite dans un esprit fort sceptique, des serments judiciaires; mais en même temps elle a pour point de départ le conte populaire du viol, entré bien auparavant dans le cycle' (*Mélanges de Littérature*, pp. 394–5). That it is a parody is obvious; but it is impossible for us to agree that it had no literary source. The 'escondit' or 'Ambiguous Oath' episode was an essential part of the Tristan romance; it is to be found in a somewhat modified form in Thomas, who wrote as early as 1170. Is it a mere coincidence that in II + V*a*, as in Beroul, it should form the dénouement to a story of unlawful love and that the scenes depicted should agree so closely in their setting? Surely it is reasonable to conclude that Pierre de Saint-Cloud was

Digitized by Google

Original from
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

parodying some version of the Tristan legend. Beroul's version, used here for purposes of comparison, is probably of later date than II + V*a*. The 'mal d'Acre' reference (Beroul, v. 3849) prevents its being dated, or at any rate Part II of it, before the year 1190. How then can the similarity between the two works be accounted for? The only possible explanation appears to be that Beroul himself, at least when writing the 'Ambiguous Oath' episode, drew from the source which Pierre de Saint-Cloud imitated and parodied, and that that source was none other than the 'Tristan dont La Chievre fist' mentioned in the prologue of II + V*a*. This solution would throw new light upon the second part of Beroul, which obviously follows a different source from the other extant versions of the legend; it would also help to explain the discrepancies between parts I and II of Beroul, and their difference in tone. It is quite conceivable that the Renart story had in its turn some influence on the 'Mal Pas' scene; the buffoonery of this part of the work and the reference to 'Malpertuis' quoted above seem to suggest some such influence.

In any case, if the 'Tristan dont La Chievre fist' be accepted as the 'estoire' to which both Pierre de Saint-Cloud and Beroul refer, it will be seen that the *Roman de Renart* throws a good deal of light on other works of the period, and that it cannot be neglected in any study of the origins and development of the Tristan legend. The acceptance of this view would also lend further support to Foulet's theory that Branches II and V*a* are the work of a single author.

W. A. TREGENZA.

FRAMLINGHAM.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

NOTES ON THE LYRICAL POETRY OF DANTE.

I.

ALLUSIONS to birds, imagery drawn from their real or supposed habits, which—whether the result of direct observation or derived from literary reminiscence—become frequent in the *Commedia*, are rare in Dante's lyrics. In *Io son venuto al punto de la rota*, we have the migrations at the approach of the winter (27–32), and, in *Doglia mi reca ne lo core ardire*, the miser is the falcon whom virtue, like the falconer, strives to entice, but who shuns the bait (106–113). The 'augelli' who sing, 'ciascuno in suo latino,' in the lyrics of Guido Cavalcanti and Dante's other predecessors are silent in the *Vita Nuova*, where the only birds are those who fall from the sky in 'lo imaginar fallace' of the death of Beatrice, in the canzone, *Donna pietosa e di novella etate* (49–53):

> Poi mi parve vedere a poco a poco
> turbar lo sole e apparir la stella,
> e pianger elli ed ella ;
> cader li augelli volando per l' are,
> e la terra tremare.

Scherillo first pointed out that this passage should be connected with Jeremiah (iv, 23–25): 'Aspexi terram, et ecce vacua erat et nihili; et caelos, et non erat lux in eis. Vidi montes, et ecce movebantur; et omnes colles conturbati sunt. Intuitus sum, et non erat homo; et omne volatile caeli recessit.' But it may be observed that Dante's line, 'cader li augelli volando per l' are,' corresponds more closely with a verse in the *Pharsalia* (IX, 649), where Lucan tells how, at the sight of the head of Medusa, 'e caelo volucres subito cum pondere lapsae.' Obviously the image is one that might have occurred to the poet independently, but it has the appearance of the modification of a scriptural text by a line from a classical poem. Here already, in an early lyric, we find that double heritage in Dante, anticipating the unique combination of the message of the Hebrew prophets with the art and language of the Latin poets, which appears again in the canzone of the *Tre donne*, and will be one of the most salient characteristics of the *Commedia*.

II.

When Boccaccio made his collection of Dante's canzoni and prefixed the Latin rubrics to each, which first appear in the manuscript in his own hand now in the Biblioteca del Cabildo at Toledo, he could find no Latin

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

equivalent for 'leggiadria,' and consequently left the word blank in his title to *Poscia ch' Amor del tutto m' ha lasciato*. In the Laurenziano XC sup. 136, the title becomes the same as that of *Le dolci rime d' amor ch' i' solia*, the scribe being unable to make a distinction in Latin between 'gentilezza' and 'leggiadria': 'Dantes de vera nobilitate egregie loquitur.' Giuseppe Zonta, in his recent edition of the *Rime*, has, I venture to think, somewhat misunderstood the meaning of the fifth stanza[1]. The poet has shown how the name 'leggiadria' is frequently misapplied and, in consequence, what is signified by it goes astray (*disvia*). He will now set forth the truth about it, premising that 'sanza oprar vertute' no one can acquire true praise, and that, since his matter (*leggiadria*) is admittedly good, it must either be virtue or connected with virtue:

> Non è pura vertù la disviata,
> poi ch' è blasmata,
> negata là 'v' è più vertù richesta,
> cioè in gente onesta
> di vita spiritale
> o in abito che di scienza tiene.
> Dunque, s' ell' è in cavalier lodata,
> sarà mischiata,
> causata di più cose; perchè questa
> conven che di sè vesta
> l' un bene e l' altro male,
> ma vertù pura in ciascuno sta bene (77–88).

By *la disviata*, Zonta understands 'falsa leggiadria,' and comments: 'Quella che non è retta, e che quindi devia dalla giusta strada, non è pura virtù; perchè è appunto biasimata da coloro che possedono maggiore virtù, cioè dagli uomini onesti e dai sapienti'; 'E se pure questa falsa leggiadria viene talora lodata in qualche cavaliere, vuol dire che essa è mescolata di bene e di male, cioè che non è legittima; invece negli uomini quella che veramente rifulge è la virtù pura.' But, surely, *la disviata* is 'leggiadria' itself which has gone astray through false application of the word, and 'vertù pura' means 'virtue pure and simple' or 'virtue strictly speaking,' like the *pure arti* of *Con.* IV, 9. On the analogy of Aristotle's treatment of *verecundia* in the fourth of the *Ethics* (*antiqua translatio*, lectio XVII)[2], Dante is showing that *leggiadria* is not strictly speaking a moral virtue. *Verecundia* is not a moral virtue in the Aristotelian sense because not suitable to every age; it is praiseworthy in the young, but not in the 'senex' or 'studiosus'; so *leggiadria* is not primarily a moral virtue, because not suited to every

[1] *Il Canzoniere di Dante Alighieri* a cura di G. Zonta (Turin, Paravia, 1923), p. 109. The text of this edition is that established by M. Barbi in his *testo critico* (Florence, 1921).

[2] In tom. XXI of the Parma edition of the works of Aquinas. Cf. canz. *Le dolci rime*, 101–108, and *Conv.* IV, 19. See Wicksteed's note on latter passage in the Temple Classics edition of the *Convivio*, p. 324.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

condition of life; it is praised in a knight, but censured in a religious or a man of science. The 'abito che di scienza tiene' is probably an equivalent for the *studiosus* of the Latin version of Aristotle, though, in the light of *Conv.* II, 12 (13), it might perhaps be taken as meaning the habit of a monastic order. Dante's *mischiata* (line 84) is likewise from Aristotle 'Non autem neque continentia virtus, sed quaedam mixta'; which Aquinas explains: 'Quae cum sit laudabilis, non est virtus, sed habet aliquid virtutis admixtum.' 'Ma vertù pura in ciascuno sta bene'; because a moral virtue is not merely fitting in supposed cases, but always, or, as Aquinas comments: 'Immo absolute eis conveniunt, sicut patet circa omnes virtutes.' Then follows the definition of 'leggiadria':

> Sollazzo è che convene
> con esso Amore e l' opera perfetta:
> da questo terzo retta
> è vera leggiadria e in esser dura,
> sì come il sole al cui esser s' adduce
> lo calore e la luce
> con la perfetta sua bella figura (89–95).

The *perfetta* of line 90 is, I take it, a verb (though *perfettare* is not elsewhere used by Dante, it is not uncommon in early Italian). The definition is modelled upon the well-known sentence of Aristotle: 'Perfecit operationem delectatio.' Cf. Aquinas (*Contra Gentiles*, III, 26): 'Ultima perfectio operationis est delectatio, quae perficit operationem, sicut pulchritudo iuventutem, ut Philosophus dicit in decimo Ethicorum.' The three factors are *Vertù*, *Sollazzo*, *Amore*. It will be remembered of course that, in early Italian, *sollazzo*, like the Provençal *solatz*, frequently had the sense of pleasure or even gallantry, rather than consolation, and was a kind of technical term in the language of chivalrous love. Cf. Giraut de Borneil, 'Per solatz reveillar.' In *Il Fiore* (79), 'Sollazzo' is one of the 'baronia d' Amore' who assemble under Love's banner to wage war upon the Castle of Jealousy. Occasionally, especially in the plural, it signified knightly exploits in tourneys and the like, as in the *Avventuroso Ciciliano*, in the account of the tournament before the Soldan of Babylon (III, 12): 'E sono posti alquanti savi a giudicare i più vertudiosi di sollazzi.' Here it seems identical with the *delectatio* of Aristotle. True *leggiadria* (the outward manifestation of a chivalrous soul) is the delight that perfects what its subject does (the 'oprare virtute' of the preceding stanza) and is directed by love. 'It abides in being even as the Sun, in whose nature heat and light combine with his own fair perfect figure.' I take it that the comparison is of *calore* with love, *luce* with joy, the *figura* with activity in virtuous deeds. Dante has said in the first stanza that *leggiadria*:

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

è bella tanto
che fa degno di manto
imperial colui dov' ella regna :
ell' è verace insegna
la qual dimostra u' la vertù dimora (12–16).

It makes its subject worthy of the highest earthly dignity, the imperial majesty and authority being 'altissima ne l' umana compagnia' (*Conv.* IV, 4). Comparing this canzone with *Le dolci rime d' amor*, we see the distinction between *gentilezza* and *leggiadria* in relation to *vertù*. The former is the inner cause in the soul of moral virtue; the latter is as it were the standard flying over the place where such virtue dwells as an outward sign of its presence within[1].

III.

In the canzone, *Doglia mi reca ne lo core ardire*, in which, as Boccaccio's rubric puts it, 'Dantes contra vitiosos et potissime contra avaros loquitur,' the poet represents virtue as the handmaiden of the soul whom, taking measure in heaven, she makes master over self and circumstance :

Servo non di signor, ma di vil servo
si fa chi da cotal serva si scosta (43–44);

and he continues, in the next stanza :

Chi è servo è come quello ch' è seguace
ratto a segnore, e non sa dove vada,
per dolorosa strada ;
come l' avaro seguitando avere,
ch' a tutti segnoreggia (64–68).

Here we seem to have reminiscences of two passages in the first book of the *Epistulae* :

Sic qui pauperiem veritus potiore metallis
libertate caret, dominum vehet inprobus atque
serviet aeternum, quia parvo nesciet uti (I, x, 39–41).

Qui melior servo, qui liberior sit avarus,
in triviis fixum cum se demittit ob assem,
non video: nam qui cupiet, metuet quoque : porro
qui metuens vivet, liber mihi non erit umquam.
Perdidit arma, locum virtutis deseruit, qui
semper in augenda festinat et obruitur re (I, xvi, 63–68).

Unless the resemblance is mere coincidence (for which it is somewhat too close), these may perhaps be added to the few reminiscences of the Epistles of Horace that have hitherto been traced in Dante.

[1] It is therefore more comprehensive than *Curialitas* as defined in the *De Vulgari Eloquentia* (I, 18) : 'Curialitas nil aliud est quam librata regula eorum quae peragenda sunt ; et quia statera huiusmodi librationis tantum in excellentissimis curiis esse solet, hinc est quod quicquid in actibus nostris bene libratum est, curiale dicatur.' Cf. the treatment and definition of *Cortesia* in *Conv.* II, 10 (11), IV, 26.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

IV.

The close spiritual affinity between the canzone, *Tre donne intorno al cor mi son venute*, and the letter, *Amico Florentino*, is sufficiently obvious. The magnanimous declaration, 'l' essilio che m' è dato onor mi tegno,' finds its logical sequence in the 'non est haec via redeundi ad patriam.' The apparition of 'Drittura' before the heart of which Love is lord leads naturally to the claim to be the 'vir praedicans iustitiam.' Canzone and letter alike hark back to Isaiah li: 'Audite me, qui scitis iustum, populus meus, lex mea in corde eorum; nolite timere opprobrium hominum, et blasphemias eorum ne metuatis' (7); 'Cito veniet gradiens ad aperiendum; et non interficiet usque ad internecionem, nec deficiet panis eius' (14). The interval between these two documents of Dante's life can hardly have been much less than ten years. The letter was probably written in the latter part of May, 1315[1]. The discovery of the opening lines of the canzone in the register of a notary at Bologna in 1310[2] shows that it cannot be later than that year, while the indications in the *Convivio* (I, 12, II, 1, IV, 27), that it was to be the matter of the penultimate treatise, make it difficult to suppose it composed after 1306. The starting point of the poem is evidently the legend of the apparition of Lady Poverty with her two companions to St Francis of Assisi (Thomas of Celano, *Legenda secunda*, II, 60, Bonaventura, *Legenda sancti Francisci*, VII, 6, the latter being the poet's immediate source), while another model was the *romanza* of Giraut de Borneil, on the decay of chivalry, 'lo dolz chans d'un auzel.' The ultimate source of such visions or allegories in which three figures are represented may possibly be found in the vision of Abraham in Genesis (xviii, 2): 'Cumque elevasset oculos, apparuerunt ei tres viri stantes prope eum; quos cum vidisset, cucurrit in occursum eorum de ostio tabernaculi, et adoravit in terram.' Richard of St Victor (*Benjamin major*, V, 8) understands the *tabernaculum* as 'humanae mentis habitaculum.'

One of the problems of the poem lies in the interpretation of the lines where the leader of the three ladies, having named herself ('Io son Drittura'), indicates her two companions:

> Poi cominciò: 'Sì come saper dei,
> di fonte nasce il Nilo picciol fiume
> quivi dove 'l gran lume
> toglie a la terra del vinco la fronda:
> sovra la vergin onda

[1] Toynbee, *Dantis Alagherii Epistolae*, p. 152.
[2] Livi, *Dante, suoi primi cultori, sua gente in Bologna*, p. 24.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

generai io costei che m' è da lato
e che s' asciuga con la treccia bionda.
Questo mio bel portato,
mirando sè ne la chiara fontana,
generò questa che m' è più lontana' (45–54).

The true key to the mystery was found by Torraca, who—starting from and correcting the gloss of Pietro Alighieri on *Inf.* VI, 73—suggested the identification of *Drittura* with Habitual Justice (Justice as a moral virtue), and her two companions with Natural Justice and Legal Justice respectively[1].

Dante is speaking of the Earthly Paradise. Cf. Gen. ii, 6, 10, 13: 'Fons ascendebat e terra, irrigans universam superficiem terrae....Et fluvius egrediebatur de loco voluptatis ad irrigandum paradisum, qui inde dividitur in quatuor capita....Et nomen fluvii secundi Gehon; ipse est qui circumit omnem terram Aethiopiae.' Augustine and Jerome identify this second river, the source of which is in the Garden of Eden, with the Nile. Lines 47–48 are usually taken as meaning 'where the foliage of the osier shields from the earth the great light of the sun'; but the anonymous writer of the commentary in the Biblioteca Nazionale of Florence (Magliabec. VII, 1152) understands 'where the great light draws from the earth the foliage of the osier,' the *vinco* being type of the plants produced *sanza seme* in the Earthly Paradise. Cf. *Purg.* XXVIII and Gen. ii, 9. In any case, the allegory signifies the origin of Law in the Earthly Paradise, which Dante will represent in another form and associated with the Empire in the story of the mystical tree in the closing cantos of the *Purgatorio*. Following Aristotle, Aquinas defines Habitual Justice, justice in general which is co-extensive with virtue, as 'habitus secundum quem aliquis constanti et perpetua voluntate ius suum unicuique tribuit' (*S. T.*, II, ii, q. 58, a. 1). He quotes Plotinus (from Macrobius) as saying 'iustitia Dei est observatio legis aeternae in suis operibus' (I, ii, q. 61, a. 5). Now, like other moral virtues, certain principles of justice are in man by nature according to a certain rudimentary aptitude (I, ii, q. 63, a. 1). This Natural Justice, as far as concerns primal man, was the Original Justice of the Garden of Eden: 'Iustitia originalis erat quoddam donum gratiae toti humanae naturae divinitus collatum in primo parente, quod quidem primus homo amisit per proprium peccatum' (I, ii, q. 81, a. 2). But, though lost in its perfection, this Natural Justice still remains in part, in man's cravings for what is just, his idea and conception of justice; it is the inclination proper to human nature as man is a rational animal, inherent in our

[1] *La canzone delle tre donne*, reprinted in *Nuovi studi danteschi* (Naples, 1921).

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

nature and manifested by reason. And from this Natural Justice is born Legal Justice, which 'ordinat actus omnium virtutum ad bonum commune' and 'respicit commune bonum ut proprium obiectum' (II, ii, q. 58, a. 6). In his letter to the Florentines (*Epist.* VI, 5), Dante writes: 'Nec advertitis dominantem cupidinem, quia caeci estis, venenoso susurrio blandientem, minis frustatoriis cohibentem, nec non captivantem vos in lege peccati, ac sacratissimis legibus, quae iustitiae naturalis imitantur imaginem, parere vetantem; observantia quarum, si laeta, si libera, non tantum non servitus esse probatur, quin immo, perspicaciter intuenti, liquet ut est ipsa summa libertas[1].' We learn from the last two cantos of the *Purgatorio* that the beginning of Legal Justice was the prohibition to eat of the fruit of the Tree in the Earthly Paradise. This, then, seems the sum of the allegory in the lines under consideration: Habitual Justice, Justice as comprehending all moral virtue, existing as an archetype in the Divine Mind, infused Natural Justice into man in the Garden of Eden, and from this Natural Justice was born Legal Justice, after the model of the prohibition to our first parents. The doctrine that law originated in the Earthly Paradise is, of course, not peculiar to Dante. Thus Boncompagno da Signa in his *Rhetorica novissima*: 'Quatuordecim fuerunt origines iuris....Prima fuit in caelis. Secunda in paradiso deliciarum. Tertia in Adam qui ius reperit naturale....In paradiso namque deliciarum supernus iudex omnes legales effectus distinxit. Iussit enim, vetuit, citavit, iudicavit, punivit atque permisit[2].'

V.

Anticipating with confidence the fulfilment of Barbi's promise to establish its authenticity, I would suggest that the sonnet, *Se vedi li occhi*, may be chronologically the latest of the *Rime*[3].

Se vedi li occhi miei di pianger vaghi
per novella pietà che 'l cor mi strugge,
per lei ti priego che da te non fugge,
Signor, che tu di tal piacere i svaghi;
con la tua dritta man, cioè, che paghi
chi la giustizia uccide e poi rifugge
al gran tiranno, del cui tosco sugge
ch' elli ha già sparto e vuol che 'l mondo allaghi.

[1] Note the echo of the Epistle of St James (i, 25): 'Qui autem perspexerit in legem perfectam libertatis.' Legal Justice, represented by Roman Law, is *la ragione scritta* (*Conv.* IV, 9), the earthly counterpart of this *lex perfecta libertatis*. It is the norm of civic life in the Earthly City; but in the Heavenly City, 'quella Roma onde Cristo è romano,' its place is taken by the *libero amore* of *Par.* XXI, 73–75.

[2] *Bibliotheca Iuridica Medii Aevi*, ed. A. Gaudenzi, vol. II, pp. 253, 254.

[3] See Barbi, noting a reservation of the present writer, *Studi danteschi*, VI, p. 135. Croce (*La poesia di Dante*, p. 47) calls this sonnet 'un anelito alla giustizia: tutto pieno di fremente orrore pel male che si vede attorno e per la paura che esso incute ai cuori fedeli, il poeta s' innalza a una preghiera perchè giustizia sia fatta.'

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

The identification, favoured by Zonta, of 'chi la giustizia uccide' with Boniface VIII and 'il gran tiranno' with Philip the Fair is not happy; if any Pope is intended, it can only, as Parodi suggested, be Clement V[1]. But are any definite persons indicated? It seems to have escaped notice that the phraseology bears a singularly close resemblance with that of the Letter to Henry of Luxembourg, one sentence of which might be said to contain the sonnet in germ: 'Hinc diu super flumina confusionis deflevimus, et patrocinia iusti regis incessanter implorabamus, qui satellitium saevi tyranni disperderet, et nos in nostra iustitia reformaret' (*Epist.* VII, 1). Here *satellitium* corresponds with 'chi la giustizia uccide,' the *saevus tyrannus* (apparently the Guelf government of Florence) reappearing presently as *Tuscana tyrannis* (*ibid.* 4), while the lines on the spreading of its poison likewise find their counterpart: 'Vere fumos, evaporante sanie, vitiantes exhalat, et inde vicinae pecudes et insciae contabescunt, dum, falsis illiciendo blanditiis et figmentis, aggregat sibi finitimos, et infatuat aggregatos' (*ibid.* 7, and cf. *Par.* IX, 127–132). The sonnet continues:

E messo ha di paura tanto gelo
nel cor de' tuo' fedei, che ciascun tace:
ma tu, foco d' amor, lume del cielo,
questa vertù, che nuda e fredda giace,
levala su vestita del tuo velo,
chè sanza lei non è in terra pace.

'Questa vertù' is, of course, justice, and the sufficient commentary on the last four lines (with their association of justice, love, and peace) is the sentence in the *Monarchia* (I, xi): 'Cumque inter alia bona hominis potissimum sit in pace vivere, ut supra dicebatur, et hoc operetur maxime atque potentissime iustitia, caritas maxime iustitiam vigorabit et potior potius.'

Parodi suggested that the 'novella pietà' might be the persecution of the Templars (cf. *Purg.* XX, 94–96). I would hazard the hypothesis that it is the death of the Emperor Henry, who in his office was 'sincerissimum inter mortales iustitiae subiectum' (*Mon.* I, xi), and who now, the victim of cupidity and treachery, lies dead. Not dissimilarly Cino da Pistoia:

In uno è morto il senno e la prodezza,
giustizia tutta e temperanza intera[2].

The current reports that Henry had been poisoned (though they seem contradicted by the opening line of Cino's canzone) might possibly have

[1] *Poesia e storia nella Divina Commedia*, p. 432 n.
[2] Canz. *Da poi che la natura ha fine 'mposto*, in Carducci, *Rime di M. Cino*, CVI.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

reached Dante and coloured his imagery. His picture of the dismay in the hearts of the faithful invites comparison with that given by Cino:

> Ma quei son morti, i quai vivono ancora,
> che avean tutta lor fede in lui fermata
> con ogni amor sì come in cosa degna;
> e malvagia fortuna in subit' ora
> ogni allegrezza nel cor ci ha tagliata:
> però ciascun come smarrito regna.
> O somma maestà giusta e benegna,
> poi che ti fu 'n piacer tôrci costui,
> danne qualche conforto per altrui.

Even Dante's 'ciascun tace' might find a counterpart in the close of his friend's poem:

> Canzon, piena d' affanni e di sospiri,
> nata di pianto e di molto dolore,
> movi piangendo, e va' disconsolata;
> e guarda che persona non ti miri
> che non fosse fedele a quel signore
> che tanta gente vedova ha lasciata;
> tu te n' andrai così chiusa e celata
> là dove troverai gente pensosa
> della singular morte dolorosa.

If this sonnet is indeed the last of Dante's lyrics, it brings the *Rime* to a noble close on the note which is that of the *Commedia*.

EDMUND G. GARDNER.

LONDON.

Digitized by Google

Original from
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

THE LITERARY ACTIVITIES OF THE SPANISH 'EMIGRADOS' IN ENGLAND[1].

(1814–1834)

It is unnecessary here to describe the political happenings which brought about the two emigrations of Spanish liberals between the years 1814 and 1834. The events of these years have great literary significance, both as postponing the outbreak of Spanish Romanticism, and as radically affecting its nature. The literary men among the exiled liberals passed into England, France and other countries, imbibed their literary ideas, wrote under their potent influence, and, when the day of return arrived, took back with them to Spain ideals and theories, which they interpreted in their own way and which passed in a new form into Spanish literature.

France is undoubtedly more important in this respect than England, but more attention has for this very reason been paid to it. In confining ourselves to the influence of England upon the *emigrados*, and an examination of their activities there, we may seem at times to be exploring an unimportant field. But although the principal influences of our own country upon Spanish Romanticism did not arise wholly, or even chiefly, from the residence there of Spanish *literatos*, the results of that residence by those who came to London are well worthy of notice. Angel de Saavedra, José de Espronceda, Antonio Alcalá Galiano, José Joaquín de Mora—these alone are great names. And when we reflect that they belong to four exiles in England during the formative period of Spanish Romanticism we are at once impelled to probe to the bottom the history of the lives in England of those men who might well have imbibed so much from our great national literature and carried it back to Spain.

[1] This study was originally intended, and announced, as the writer's contribution to the recently-issued volumes of *Homenaje a Menéndez Pidal*. An account of a period in which Spanish and English literary men were thrown closely together by circumstances, and developed a deep mutual regard, seemed a singularly appropriate subject to be associated with the name of a Spanish scholar who is a Doctor of an English University, and whose manifold activities, both practical and academic, have done much to draw our two countries together more closely. Unfortunately the subject proved to be beyond the compass of a short paper, and had to give place to another. In presenting his original theme, however, the writer wishes to connect it with its original purpose by re-affirming his own deep sense of indebtedness to the frequent kindnesses as well as to the vast erudition and labour of D. Ramón Menéndez Pidal.

I take pleasure in acknowledging here my indebtedness to Professor Milton A. Buchanan, of the University of Toronto, who has shown great interest in the progress of this study, and given me here and there some interesting information.

Digitized by Google

Original from
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Our inquiry is divided into two parts. We shall first discuss the influence of England upon the principal Spanish authors who resided there, considering also the activities of a few who contributed less largely to the fortunes of Romanticism in Spain. We shall then deal with the great phenomenon of the emigration into England, viz. the large number of Spanish journals which were published in London between 1814 and 1834. Little, it is true—and naturally enough—can be found in these journals themselves about their principal contributors, but we shall discover many sidelights upon English influences in Spanish literature and the result of any such survey should be a further addition to our knowledge of Spanish Romanticism. Finally a list of the journals in question will be added, together with some bibliographical notes upon them. A complete bibliography of the works of the exiles who are here dealt with will be incorporated in a larger bibliography which I have in preparation, as in that way it will be both more easily accessible and more serviceable.

I.

Angel de Saavedra (1791–1865), afterwards Duque de Rivas, must have the first place among the exiles—though he was not the first to reach England—on account of his pre-eminent position among the Romantics in Spain. Saavedra had wintered at Gibraltar after quitting Spain in 1823, and he left for England only in May 1824, writing on the way the lyrics *A las estrellas*[1] and *Super Flumina*[2], together with a longer poem *El Desterrado*[3]. We know little of his life in London, which was short and not altogether pleasant[4]. The climate he found trying to his health—hence the reference in the *Sueño del Proscrito* to

> las nieblas hórridas
> Del frío Támesis,—

and, unwilling to face an English winter, he returned to Gibraltar in the December of the same year 1824. He was not inactive, however, in London. The 'gigantic trees of Kensington gardens[5],' and other such spots, inspired him, and besides publishing the *Desterrado*, which Ochoa called his first Romantic effort[6], in the *Ocios de Españoles Emigrados*,

[1] *Obras*, ed. 1894, Vol. II, p. 59. [2] *Ibid.*, pp. 37–9, in fragmentary form.
[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 41–57.
[4] For such details as are available, see my *Angel de Saavedra, Duque de Rivas, a critical study* (*Revue hispanique*, Vol. LVIII, 1924), and, for other matters relative to Rivas and his work, this same study together with a briefer one, *Rivas and Romanticism in Spain* (Liverpool, Univ. Press, 1923).
[5] *Discurso de recepción leído en la Real Academia Española la tarde del 29 de Octubre de* 1834.
[6] *Apuntes de una biblioteca de escritores españoles contemporáneos*, II, p. 693.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

he wrote the Ossianic *Sueño del Proscrito*[1], the short poem *Cristóbal Colón*[2], and the first two cantos of his *Florinda*[3], which he completed at Gibraltar and Malta in 1825. It is well known how strong were English influences upon Saavedra during his stay in Malta; and, although he was for so short a time in England, we cannot doubt that his London experiences helped to pre-dispose him towards those influences which the comradeship of John Hookham Frere was later to convey.

The dates of José de Espronceda's (1808–1842) residence in London are ill-defined. He appears to have arrived there from Lisbon in 1824, and to have left with 'Teresa' for Paris in 1829 or 1830: the dating of certain poems written from London helps us to determine these details[4]. The fact that in the *Pensamiento* for 1841[5] Espronceda's poem *A Matilde* (beginning 'Aromosa, blanca viola'; ed. 1884, p. 226) is dated 'London, 1832,' must be placed against these dates which limit his stay[6]. As his object in coming to London (besides that of securing greater safety than in Portugal) was to follow Teresa, it is not surprising that there is small trace of his literary activities. His biographers all repeat, however, that he read widely in English—particularly Shakespeare, Milton and Byron—and it may be safely assumed that the great hold of Byron upon him is largely attributable to his reading during the second emigration. We find, then, that each of the two emigration periods played its part in the literary formation of a Spanish Romantic who must be placed in the very first rank among his fellows.

Returning to the earlier period to commence a more strictly chronological survey, we are at once struck by the dominance of the personality of José María Blanco y Crespo ('Blanco White,' 1775–1841) who lived in England from 1810 till his death and might therefore be expected to be the centre of the exiles' literary activities. As will be seen, he had been established there for some years at the time of the first emigration. From 1810 to 1814, indeed, he had edited a paper known as *El Español*, in which, after defending liberal doctrines as a patriotic Spaniard[7], for a time he took up the cause of the rebels in Buenos Aires, with the result that the organ became the centre of a protracted quarrel and emerged as the champion of the revolting anti-Spaniards. The *Español* was

[1] *Op. cit.*, pp. 63–5. [2] *Op. cit.*, pp. 61–2. [3] *Op. cit.*, pp. 361–414.

[4] The *Serenata* ('Delio a las rejas de Elisa,' ed. 1884, p. 149) is dated 'London, 1828.' The poem, *A la Patria* ('¡Cuán solitaria la nación...!'), ed. 1884, p. 207, is dated 1828 in *El Español* (March 1836), and 'Londres, 1829' in the first and later editions of *Poesías*. See *Revue hispanique*, XVII, p. 711, XX, pp. 9–10, where Professor P. H. Churchman weighs the evidence. [5] II, pp. 315–16. [6] See Note 4 above.

[7] *Prospecto*, No. 1, p. 1, 'El autor se gloria de tener algún derecho al título de amante de la causa Española.' p. 2, 'La timidez, por no decir la malicia, de un gobierno ignorante y suspicaz, le obligó a escribir con ataduras en España, y al fin a cesar de todo punto.'

Digitized by Google Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

therefore very soon prohibited in Spain[1]. It has no literary interest, even the political verses which characterise most of its contemporaries being practically absent from its pages.

There was living in London at that time a German publisher of great parts, named Rudolph Ackermann (1764–1834). The son of a saddler, he had left his native country as a youth, settled in London, married an Englishwoman and become naturalized as a British subject. He first picked up a living in journalism, but soon started to publish, and after turning out books on painting, carriage-building and other subjects, including periodicals entitled *Repository of Arts, Literature and Fashion* and *Ackermann's Juvenile Forget-me-not*, he conceived the idea of exploiting the Spanish language. So he had various works translated into Spanish, with a view to propagating them in Spanish America, whither his eldest son went to settle and carry on the business. And in other ways, from this stage onwards, he enters into our study.

Ackermann found in Blanco White the very man to start his Spanish-American schemes. 'When *Doblado's Letters*,' says Blanco, 'had given me a certain degree of consequence in the book-market, Mr Ackermann, of the Strand, who wished to publish a Spanish Journal, for Spanish America, urged me to write it for him. I was very reluctant;... the idea of degrading myself into a literary *Gallantee-show* man revolted me. But I considered the subject in another point of view: I might make the intended Journal a vehicle of useful information, to people speaking a language, which does not abound in books suited to their circumstances. This thought decided me: I engaged to write the Journal[2].'

Of how and why Blanco brought the *Variedades*, as the journal was called, to an untimely end, his own autobiography tells[3]. We shall find in that work occasional mentions of one exile or another, but it is principally concerned with his religious beliefs and experiences. Nor do the *Letters from Spain*[4], or other accounts of his life[5] drawn from varied sources, bear testimony to his having mixed with the emigrants as much as one might have expected. True, we find him welcoming Lista at Oxford[6], or appealing for financial help for a group of exiles[7],

[1] Vol. II, p. 341, from which also it appears that Cortes and Blanco collaborated in the *Español* and also in a periodical called the *Colombiano*, of which latter I have found no trace.

[2] *The Life of the Rev. Joseph Blanco White*, written by himself. London, 1845, Vol. I, pp. 224–5.

[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 225–9.

[4] June, 1822. Some of the letters had been published earlier in the *New Monthly Magazine*.

[5] E.g. *Vida y Obras de D. José Mª Blanco y Crespo* por Mario Méndez Bejarano, Madrid, 1920.

[6] This, however, was not until 1831.

[7] In 1824 (*Life*, I, p. 410).

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

or writing, with scant respect, of Mora[1], who succeeded him in Ackermann's business house. But with such slight intercourse as these references suggest he appears to have been content.

Bartolomé José Gallardo (1776–1852) reached England by way of Portugal, landing in Bristol and travelling thence to London (1814). The British Government offered him in common with other emigrants a small sum of money, which he accepted, and, so far as we can see, he settled down to a life of literary activity, in the British Museum and elsewhere, which lasted until his return to Spain[2]. Among the journals to which he contributed was the Portuguese review *O Portuguez*; he issued, too, the prospectus of a review which he intended to bring out himself, entitled: *Gabinete de Curiosidades políticas y literarias de España e Indias: Periódico mensual*[3]. When the liberals triumphed in 1820 we find Gallardo pronouncing a patriotic oration at a gathering of the Spanish *emigrados* in London, and soon afterwards leaving for Paris and Spain. Details of some of his literary productions in London have recently been collected by a Spanish scholar[4], but unfortunately the great majority of the writings themselves were lost in a disaster three years after Gallardo's return from England.

A great enemy of Gallardo's[5], whose name perhaps is otherwise hardly known to literature, was Antonio Puigblanch (1775–1842). Puigblanch, who was in both emigrations—in the second one perhaps from choice—wrote many books, and announced many others which he would write if some Mæcenas would finance them! It is sufficient to record some representative titles and pass on[6], merely pausing to quote an interesting note from one of his numerous self-advertising announcements:

> La Cataluña en todos tiempos reputada no muy literata es la más interesada en promover las miras del Dr. P., no sólo por el mérito tal cual fuere de sus anunciadas obras, sino también por lo que pueda el ejemplo de un patricio estimular a la Juventud Catalana.

[1] Letters, quoted by Méndez Bejarano, *op. cit.*, pp. 158, 173.

[2] Sr. Sainz Rodriguez, to whose writings I am indebted for much of the paragraphs on Gallardo, has recently published some of Gallardo's letters in the *Revue hispanique*. One of them, to Andrés Bello, headed '3 Chapel St, Pentonville, 1 de Octubre de 1816,' is among those which he wrote in London (Vol. LI, p. 571).

[3] 'Nuestro primer pensamiento,' he says, 'al arribar a Inglaterra, fué emprender esta tarea a pesar de la escasez de nuestras fuerzas y recursos.' Sr. Sainz Rodriguez quotes from the prospectus, which is extremely rare, in *Revue hispanique*, Vol. LI, pp. 492–5.

[4] *Revue hispanique*, Vol. LI, pp. 291, 491 ff.

[5] To him was due the failure of Gallardo's attempt to start the *Gabinete*.

[6] *The Inquisition Unmasked* (in the British Museum) is the chief and as representative as any. At the end of the prospectus appear the titles of ten other works, not all at that time published. The following indicate his bent: *Damnables Ficciones que...ha usado en varios tiempos el Clero en España para sorprender al Pueblo a título de Piedad; Vanidad de la Nobleza Hereditaria, o cada cual hijo de sus obras; Meditación en prosa y lamentación en verso sobre la gran culada que hemos dado los Españoles bajo la dinastía Francesa de Borbón.*

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

'Dr P.,' who was himself, of course, a Catalonian, provides us with an early example of modern Catalonian self-consciousness!

About the second emigration we have far fuller information than of the first. Much of the literary work of the victims of 1823 who came to London is connected with the name of José Joaquín de Mora (1783–1864). From various sources it is possible to compile an adequate account of the manifold achievements of this energetic exile during his four years in England. He was a scholar of parts, and already a skilled journalist[1] when fate drove him to London in 1823 and threw him into the company of Blanco White. Blanco liked Mora, and induced the enterprising Ackermann to give him some work: the result was the publication of *No me olvides*, a small annual collection of his prose and verse (intended for giving as a present) which Mora continued each year that he remained in England, and which Blanco encouraged by giving it eulogistic reviews[2]. In 1825 Ackermann started the *Museo universal*[3], giving it to Mora to edit, which he did until the end of 1826. Meanwhile Blanco's *Variedades* had stopped (Oct. 1, 1825), and Mora was also commissioned to edit its successor (*Correo literario y político de Londres*[4]) which ran from Jan. 1 to Oct. 1, 1826. Some account will be given of this review below, but it may be said here that it was intended for Spanish-American readers, supporting strongly the independence of the young republics. Hence it gives biographies of liberal American leaders and reviews and analyses of the works of liberal poets such as the Chilean Lacunza and the Mexican Gorostiza. It recommends, too, with enthusiasm the *Victoria de Junín* of J. J. de Olmedo.

Besides editing these periodicals Mora wrote many miscellaneous works—most of them of no great literary interest[5],—including three

[1] He had gone to France in 1809, when wounded in the War of Independence, and spent some time in England also. From 1814 to 1816 he published the *Crónica científica y literaria*, and afterwards became its principal editor in its new form *El Constitucional* (1820–2). During this last period he was also editing *La Miscelánea*, and in 1823 had been appointed to the staff of the *Eco de Padilla* when he was proscribed and left Spain.

[2] E.g. that of the first number (in *Variedades*, July 1, 1824): 'Si el autor...se empeña en el estudio de los buenos autores británicos, tanto en verso como en prosa, talentos tiene sin duda, para dejarse atrás a muchos de los más afamados españoles. Su prosa es elegante y fácil. Su poesía se acerca varias veces a la realidad y sinceridad de sentimientos que echo de menos en casi toda la poesía española; y, en general, es agraciada en el estilo usado.'

[3] See below, Sect. II.

[4] See below, Sect. II.

[5] They are as follows:

1. *Memorias de la Revolución de Méjico, o de la Expedición del general don Francisco Javier Mina, a que se han agregado algunas observaciones sobre la comunicación proyectada entre los dos Océanos Pacífico y Atlántico*, escritas en inglés por William Davis Róbinson, 1824.
2. *La Persia, o descripción abreviada de aquel país*, 2 vols, 1825.
3. *Cartas sobre la educación del bello sexo*, 1 vol., 1825.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

volumes of a series of text-books for American children which Ackermann provided[1]. He occupied himself more and more with American themes, continually encouraging the young republics and attacking the colonial system of Spain as well as her political *régime* and her backwardness in science and industry. It would therefore not have come as a surprise when he announced his impending departure for America in the *Correo* for Oct. 1, 1826. He arrived at Buenos Aires on Feb. 1, 1827[2].

Mora's principal services to Spanish literature during his residence in England from 1823 to 1827 were undoubtedly his attempts to popularise Sir Walter Scott by translating *The Talisman* and *Ivanhoe*[3]—attempts which, though made principally in the interests of young America[4], enjoyed greater and more lasting success in Spain. This matter has already been studied in detail[3], but it may be thought worth while to quote an interesting review by Bello of Mora's translation of *Ivanhoe*.

> El traductor ha reproducido los dotes del autor con mucha felicidad en el castellano, y a fuerza de talento ha superado las dificultades no pequeñas que ofrece la diferente índole de las dos lenguas, acercándose mucho a la excelencia del original aún en el estilo descriptivo, sin embargo de la superior copia, facilidad y concisión del idioma inglés. No aseguramos que el doctor Dryasdust quedase completamente satisfecho con los equivalentes castellanos de algunas voces y frases relativas a ciertos usos de las edades caballerescas. Pero ¡ qué diferencia entre el feudalismo español, modificado por la influencia arábiga, y el estado social que la conquista normanda produjo en Inglaterra ! Los glosarios de ambos son por consiguiente diferentísimos, y no se puede verter el uno en el otro, si no aproximadamente, o empleando circunlocuciones embarazosas. El traductor del *Ivanhoe* ha tenido razón en preferir el primer medio[5].

4. Translation of Scott's *Talisman*, with a prefatory essay, 2 vols, 1825.
5. Translation of Scott's *Ivanhoe*, 2 vols, 1825.
6. *Cuadros de la Historia de los Arabes desde Mahoma hasta la conquista de Granada*, 2 vols, 1826. (See *Correo literario y político de Londres*, Apr. 1, 1826.)
7. *Historia antigua de Méjico por don Francisco Saverio Clavigero*, traducida del italiano, 2 vols, 1826.
8. *Meditaciones poéticas* (based on Robert Blair's poem *The Grave*), 1826.

[1] They are on Spanish grammar, geography and Latin grammar respectively. The curious reader may consult the last-named in the British Museum (12934 . b . 7).

[2] We may add (though it falls outside our period) that after being expelled from Bolivia in 1831 and following several other crises, Mora returned to London in 1838 as Consul-General of the Peruvio-Bolivian Confederation. The literary interest of this return is his publication in London (1840) of the *Leyendas Españolas*, a work of considerable significance. In 1843 he returned to Spain as director of the Colegio de San Felipe, Cádiz, and finally went to Madrid, where after so turbulent a career he became a respectable academician.

[3] See P. H. Churchman and E. Allison Peers, 'A Survey of the Influence of Sir Walter Scott in Spain,' *Revue hispanique*, Vol. LV, 1922.

[4] As witness the preface to his translation of the *Talisman*: 'Nos lisonjeamos con la esperanza de que los pueblos de la América que fué española, rectificadas sus ideas en fuerza de las reformas políticas que han abrazado, sepan apreciar, aún en los ramos de lujo y recreo, lo que es realmente bueno, por estar de acuerdo con las reglas eternas del orden. Si merece su aprobación este ensayo, no tardaremos en ofrecerles las obras maestras de la misma pluma.'

[5] *Repertorio americano*, Vol. I.

Digitized by Google Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Equally important with Mora is Antonio Alcalá Galiano (1789–1865), who played so important a part in the history of *Don Alvaro*[1]. From 1823 to 1830 he was in England, whence he went to France till the death of Fernando VII in 1833 ended the period of exile. Alcalá Galiano arrived in London on December 28, 1823, some five months before his friend Saavedra. Though all but penniless he refused to accept the help which the British Government was giving many of his contemporaries, because he was writing a life of Riego (which he never finished) and in it censuring the attitude of Britain to Spain in the recent crisis. He had therefore to give lessons and write pot-boiling articles for a living, and for seven months he lived with Istúriz, at the latter's invitation.

In August 1825 he was joined by his family, and when three years later a 'body of shareholders' founded a 'University of London' he was invited to fill the 'Chair of Spanish' at a salary of £200 a year. 'So,' he relates in his biography, 'my lot was greatly improved[2].'

His inaugural lecture to the 'University' may be read in the British Museum[3]. It has the ambitious aim of giving a comprehensive account of the Spanish language and of Spanish literature from the *Cid* to modern times. As he modestly but truly remarks, it is a 'very imperfect sketch of the literary history of Spain'—Lope de Vega gets *one line*! Of modern literature he says no more than that it is 'swamped by political troubles[4].' It is an interesting testimony to the number of *emigrados* in London, or perhaps rather to the enthusiasm which they aroused, that this lecture, though written in English, went into a second edition in 1829, the year after its first publication.

Evidently Alcalá Galiano soon became reconciled to life in England, finding many friends among the English[5], and only leaving it to go to

[1] See *Angel de Saavedra, Duque de Rivas, a Critical Study*, pp. 46 ff.

[2] Appendix A to his *Memorias* (1886) from which most of these biographical details are taken.

[3] An Introductory Lecture delivered in the University of London, on Saturday, November 15, 1828, by Don Antonio Alcalá Galiano, Professor of the Spanish Language and Literature. London, Printed for John Taylor, Bookseller and Publisher to the University of London, 30, Upper Gower Street. 1828. pp. 33. 1*s*.

[4] He quotes, while speaking of the beauties of the Spanish language, some 'lines, written by one of my best friends, which have been very much admired by many of my English private pupils.' They begin:

Encantadas riberas del Betis,
Sacros bosques de adelfas y rosas...

and are to be found in the *Sueño del Proscrito* of the Duque de Rivas, dated 'London, 1824' (*Obras*, ed. 1894, Vol. II, pp. 64–5).

[5] 'Encontré también entre los ingleses amigos como no se encuentran en otro país del mundo, distinguiéndose entre todas las familias la de que forma parte lady Francklin, mujer del famoso oficial y navegante, hoy perdido en el hielo del Polo: familia que llegó a mirarme como si fuese de ella misma.'

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Paris with some of his fellow-exiles who had formed the idea of attacking the Spanish Government through France. This met with no acceptance from Constant, and Alcalá Galiano returned to England, but after a 'very few days' left it again for France with his family. He seems to have absorbed very little of English literature and to have left few written articles in the Anglo-Spanish periodicals. Doubtless this is attributable to the penurious state in which he found himself, and which forced him to take up scholastic work to gain a living.

Among the minor writers who were in England during the second emigration are a few of considerable interest. Salas y Quiroga would be one of them had he done more than pay a short visit to England, as also to France, on his return from a journey to South America (1830–2). Argüelles ('El Divino,' 1776–1844), like Saavedra and Alcalá Galiano, went to Gibraltar, at the time of the 1823 crisis, and thence to England,

> Objeto de sus predilecciones, donde fué recibido como lo merecía la ilustre fama de su nombre, donde renovó amistades que había contraído en tiempos para él, sin duda, más felices[1].

All we know of his life in England is that Lord Holland made him his librarian, at a salary which relieved the penury in which he found himself. He returned to Spain only in 1834. Another great personality in the Spanish colony from 1823–4 and 1830–3[2] was the Mexican Gorostiza (1789–1851), whose importance, however, is mainly political and due to the interest of the colony in persons and things American. After serving in the Spanish army he abandoned arms for letters, and had published a volume of plays in Paris (1822) before coming to England. On his return to London in 1830 as 'ministro plenipotenciario,' he published his best drama, *Contigo pan y cebolla*, rewrote *Las costumbres de antaño* and published also a *Cartilla política*. His plays, however, are not only Moratinian but mediocre.

Quite a different type of *emigrado* was Vicente Salvá y Pérez, a bookseller and publisher as active as Ackermann and more important to letters, as all who have done research work in the period know. Coming to London in 1823 he continued the trade which he had taken up when the French invasion of 1808 had driven him from the University of Alcalá to Valencia. London seems to have inspired him as much as it did others: if it did we may be grateful. His biographer puts it thus:

> Continuó ejerciendo su profesión de librero, y principió a manifestar, que si hasta entonces no se había dado a conocer mucho en la república de las letras, era

[1] San Miguel, *Vida*, etc., Vol. III, p. 135.
[2] The intervening years he spent as *chargé d'affaires* in Brussels.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

por creer que el hombre debe leer y estudiar antes que escribir, y que en la primera mitad de la vida han de recogerse materiales para madurarlos y coordinarlos en la última.

In any case he became wonderfully productive, bringing out in London the two parts of his comprehensive and famous *Catálogo*; writing an introduction to and preparing an edition of the *Guerras de Granada*, which came out in Valencia in 1830; collaborating in an English-Spanish dictionary; writing a Spanish grammar; and contributing to the *Repertorio americano* various bibliographical articles, notably one on Spanish chivalric romances. In 1830 he transferred his business to Paris, and, after refusing in 1833 an offer of repatriation because it was not accorded to his fellow-exiles, he finally returned to Spain in 1835.

Cristóbal de Beña, who figures in the *Biblioteca de autores españoles* (Vol. LXVII), was something of a poetaster, copying La Fontaine's and Iriarte's fables and writing mediocre lyric verse. He published a volume of collected poems in London (1813) entitled *La Lira de la libertad*[1], the most interesting point about which is the influence upon their author of Ossian[2]. Practically no other details of his life during the wars and emigrations are available.

These notes are manifestly incomplete by the omission of one man, whose life and work, however, I hope to make the subject of a considerably longer article: Telesforo Trueba y Cosío (1799–1835). This brilliant young author emigrated to England from Cádiz in 1823, leaving it ten years later at the amnesty, and becoming deputy for his native city of Santander. His residence in England was marked by a large output of works in English as well as in Spanish, his mastery of our own language being so complete that hostile critics attacked the correctness of his Spanish on the strength of it. The chief importance of Trueba y Cosío being the influence upon him of Sir Walter Scott, and the part which he played in the development of the Spanish novel, I have thought it best to say no more of his writings here and to consider them later in connection with that wider and more important subject.

(*To be continued*)

E. ALLISON PEERS.

LIVERPOOL.

[1] See A. de Castro, *Cádiz en la Guerra de la Independencia*, Cádiz, 1864, pp. 156–9.
[2] See my article 'The Influence of Ossian in Spain' in *Philological Quarterly*, Vol. III, 1924.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

THE SONG OF GROTTI.

ONE of the best known and in many respects most remarkable parts of Snorri Sturluson's *Edda* is the story of the magic mill and the two giantesses Menja and Fenja, told in chapter XLIII of the *Skáldskaparmál*[1].

Snorri mentions the story to explain the expression *Fróði's Flour*, a kenning applied to gold. There are two versions of the tale, one in a prose narrative and the other in a poem written in the metre called *Fornyrdislag*. The latter is evidently not the work of Snorri, but was added by a copyist[2]; for both versions are not agreed in some important details. Thus in the prose narrative the enemy of King Fróði is called Mysing, whereas he is the far-famed Hrolfr Kraki in the poem[3]. It is therefore probable that there existed in Scandinavia two different versions of the story.

The similarity of Snorri's prose version and a well-known folktale which is still current in the Scandinavian North and elsewhere has been pointed out repeatedly[4]. There are, however, two fundamental differences between the Eddic narratives on the one hand and the Märchen versions on the other. The latter are unanimous in describing the mill as one of those self-working tools so common in fairy stories[5]. No mention is made of the two giantesses. Furthermore, the Märchen say nothing about a king showing the characteristics of Fróði. The protagonists are generally two brothers, one rich, the other poor. The latter is given the magic mill by some benevolent being[6]. His brother by a

[1] For this study I use the edition of Ernst Wilken, *Die Prosaische Edda*, Paderborn, 1877, pp. 123–134; cf. also Hugo Gering, *Die Edda*, Leipzig, s.d., pp. 376–380; Axel Olrik, *Danmarks Heltedigtning*, København, 1903, I, pp. 278 ff.

[2] E. Mogk, in Paul's *Grundriss*, II, 1, pp. 608–9 and 663.

[3] Stanza 22.

[4] Cf. F. Liebrecht, *Zur Volkskunde*, Heilbronn, 1879, p. 302; W. A. Clouston, *Popular Tales and Fictions*, Edinburgh, 1887, I, p. 118; F. von der Leyen, *Das Märchen in den Göttersagen der Edda*, Berlin, 1899, p. 59; Bolte-Polívka, *Märchen-Anmerkungen*, II, p. 439; H. Lessmann, *Der deutsche Volksmund im Lichte der Sage*, pp. 206 ff.; Olrik, *op. cit.*, I, pp. 290 ff.; Aarne, *Verzeichnis der Märchentypen*, Helsinki, 1910, type 565; L. von Schroeder, 'Germanische Elben und Götter beim Estenvolke,' *Sitzungsberichte der Wiener Akad., phil.-hist. Klasse*, cliii, 1906, Abh. I, p. 42.

[5] Clouston, op. *cit.*, I, pp. 88 ff., 116 ff.; Grimm, *Deutsche Mythologie*, Berlin, 1875–8, II, p. 725; III, p. 264; Gummere, *Germanic Origins*, New York, 1892, p. 237.

[6] It is an old woman in Colshorn, *Märchen und Sagen*, Hannover, 1854, p. 78, No. 25: *Die kleine Mühle*, and No. 61, p. 173: *Warum das Meerwasser salzig ist*; the devil in Dasent, *Popular Tales from the Norse*, Edinburgh, 1859, p. 10: *Why the Sea is Salt*, in Rittershaus, *Die neuisländischen Volksmärchen*, Halle, 1902, p. 336, No. 91: *Die Teufelsmühle*, in Paul Kretschmer, *Neugriechische Märchen*, Jena, 1919, p. 216, No. 50: *Die Zaubermühle*, and in Kühnau, *Schlesische Sagen*, Leipzig, 1910–13, II, p. 736: *Die Teufelsmühle*; an angel in A. von Löwis of Menar, *Finnische und estnische Volksmärchen*, Jena, 1922, p. 290: *Die Geldmühle*.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

trick[1] finds out the cause of his unexpected wealth and buys the quern from him. He does not reap, however, the hoped-for benefits from it; the mill rather turns out to bring about his own discomfiture[2].

There can be little doubt that Snorri's source was a poem or a number of poems of the same type as the *Song of Grotti* quoted by the scribe. This song has certain peculiarities which we may call dramatic or ritualistic. Out of ninty-one lines only seventeen are descriptive[3], while seventy-four are devoted to the song or lament of the two girls. This feature suggests a dramatic or liturgic origin, and this suggestion will receive a good deal of probability if such an origin will satisfactorily explain why the theme of the giantesses and King Fróði was grafted on the old folktale of the magic quern.

Snorri has a good deal to tell about King Fróði. He describes him as a mighty king of the North and whose name was known wherever the Norse tongue was spoken. His reign was a golden age, when peace reigned on earth. No blood feud interfered with the general happiness of man, and golden rings could lie safely on Jalangrs Heath, no one taking them up[4]. Snorri and Saxo Grammaticus[5] make Fróði the contemporary of the emperor Augustus, stating that during his reign Christ was born. Other accounts, notably that of Saxo[6], agree with the version of Snorri, and it has been noted by scholars that King Fróði is merely the god Frey in human form, an anthropomorphic or perhaps euhemerized deity of the fertility of the earth, a god of plenty, whose reign was a golden age of peace and prosperity, but came to a sudden and disastrous end[7]. Both Snorri and Saxo mention these features, but Snorri stands alone in connecting the king's death with the two giantesses and the magic quern. Scandinavian tradition does not help us further in the solution of the problem, and we must look for parallels elsewhere, trusting that the comparative method may be of avail where the philological alone cannot be applied for lack of documents.

[1] The owner of the quern borrows a measure from his brother to measure his gold. The brother besmears the measure with tar, and a piece of gold remains sticking to the bottom of the vessel; cf. on this motif Bolte-Polívka, III, p. 143, n. 1.

[2] So in the versions of Dasent, Rittershaus and Kühnau.

[3] G. Neckel, *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum*, XLVIII, pp. 168 f., believes that these are later additions.

[4] Cf. on this theme my study 'The Ploughman King,' *Revue Hispanique*, XLVI, pp. 525–6; Lessmann, *op. cit.*, p. 209.

[5] *Gesta Danorum*, ed. A. Holder, Strassburg, 1886, p. 170.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 164.

[7] Von Hahn, *Sagwissenschaftliche Studien*, Jena, 1876, p. 486; Uhland, *Schriften zur Geschichte der Dichtung und Sage*, Stuttgart, 1865–73, III, pp. 237 ff., 423–4; VII, pp. 111 ff.; E. Mogk, *op. cit.*, p. 608: 'Das Unheil, das die Mägde bringen, erinnert an den Untergang des goldenen Zeitalters der Götter nach der Völuspa, der ja ebenfalls durch Riesenmädchen herbeigeführt wird.'

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Humanized fertility demons invested with royal dignity are by no means limited to Scandinavia. In quite a number of countries they were said to have ruled in olden times, and their rule is described as a reign of peace and plenty, a golden age; for it is one of the oddities of the human mind to imagine that age of bliss to lie in the past, irrevocable and lost for ever[1]. Thus the Egyptian priests spoke of such a wonderful age before the rise of the royal dynasties of the Pharaohs[2]. The compilers of *Genesis* as well as Hesiod were animated by the same ideas, and the age of reason saw a strange revival of such primitive fancy in the brilliant sophistries of Jean Jacques Rousseau. Osiris and Saturnus are the Egyptian and Italian counterparts of the Norse Fróði.

It likewise is a common peculiarity of all these myths that the golden age comes to a sudden end. The good prince dies a violent death and departs this earth for ever, to withdraw to the far-off island of the blessed, a mythical fairy land. Generally, the names of those mythical kings were not forgotten. Their death was celebrated in annual festivals, mourning festivals, as a rule, followed sometimes by wild outbursts of joy at the news that the god-king had risen from the dead. Thanks to Sir J. G. Frazer's monumental work we are all familiar with such imaginings and the corresponding rites, which recur in Egypt, in Syria, in Phrygia and which are doubtless at the root of the Oriental religion whose destiny it was to supplant the older ones and to take root among the most progressive nations of the ancient world.

One of these festivals of general mourning over the death of a vegetation demon was annually celebrated in Mysia, on the coast of the Propontis. It was connected with the name of King Kyzikos, said to have ruled over the Doliones in ancient times. His fate is narrated by quite a number of ancient writers and alluded to by others[3]. It may be summarized in the following words.

Kyzikos, a young king, betrothed to Kleite[4] hospitably receives the Argonauts when they land on his shores, in obedience to an oracle. When they depart they are driven back to their moorings by contrary winds. In the darkness of the night they are mistaken for enemies by their hosts[5] and are attacked. In the fray Kyzikos is slain by Iason, or,

[1] Tylor, *Primitive Culture*, New York, 1883, I, p. 40; *Researches into the Early History of Mankind*, New York, 1878, p. 152; Andree, *Ethnographische Parallelen und Vergleiche*, N.F., Leipzig, 1889, p. 21.

[2] Maspéro, *Histoire ancienne des peuples de l'Orient*, Paris, 1886, pp. 18 and 33.

[3] Stoll in Roscher's *Ausführliches Lexikon*, II, 1, cc. 1772–6; Sir J. G. Frazer, 'Apollodorus,' *The Library*, London, 1921, I, p. 99; J. Marquardt, *Cyzicus und sein Gebiet*, Berlin, 1836, p. 43.

[4] According to other accounts she was his young wife, or he was betrothed to Larissa, daughter of Piasos.

[5] Roscher, *op. et loc. cit.*; Marquardt, *op. et loc. cit.*

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

according to other versions, by Herakles[1] or the Dioskouroi[2]. After realizing the fatal error, the Argonauts give him honourable burial and institute funeral games[3]. Apollonius Rhodius mentions the fact that the inhabitants of Kyzikos celebrated their eponymous hero by an annual mourning festival[4]. Another myth narrated that Kleite, in despair at the death of her betrothed, hanged herself. From her tears arose the spring called after her name[5]. Scholars are agreed in regarding Kyzikos as one of those innumerable youths doomed to a premature death[6], and instinctively we recall Hyakinthos, Hylos, Attis, Adonis, Osiris, and Balder. Kleite's tragic death especially reminds us of the death of Nanna, so touchingly told by Snorri Sturluson.

Practically all these heroes, Greek and Barbarian, have been recognized as fertility demons representing the growing and decay of vegetation in the temperate zones[7]. The mode of their death varies in the different myths and even in different variants of the same myth. Thus Osiris and Balder are killed by the wiles of envious twin brothers[8]. Adonis and Attis perish by the tusks of a wild boar, the representative of the chthonic powers. Hylos is snatched by water nymphs. The death of Kyzikos itself is told differently by the various authors of antiquity. According to one version he is killed by accident, being hit by a stray arrow[9]. Others narrate that his people mistook the Argonauts for enemies and attacked them, and that he was killed in the fray by night. According to still other sources, he recognized the error and desired to separate the fighting parties, but met with his death in this attempt. The latter accounts stand alone in stating that Kyzikos' people attacked the Argonauts on their first landing, because they came from Thessaly and because the Doliones, having themselves been driven thence, bore a grudge against the inhabitants of that country[10]. There are reasons which make it probable that in this point the version preserved by the scholiast on Apollonius Rhodius stands closer to the original than any of the others.

Kyzikos is a local hero revered by the inhabitants of Mysia. His

[1] Orph., *Argon.*, 527.
[2] Schol. Ap. Rhod., *Argon.*, I, 1040.
[3] Ap. Rhod., *Argon.*, I, 1055 ff.; Orph., *Argon.*, 566 ff.; Hyg., *fab.*, 273.
[4] Ap. Rhod., *Argon.*, I, 1075.
[5] *Ibid.*, I, 1063; Schol., I, 974, 1063, 1065, 1068; Parth., 28.
[6] R. H. Klausen, *Aeneas und die Penaten*, Hamburg u. Gotha, 1839-40, pp. 139-40; Roscher, *op. et loc. cit.*
[7] Sir J. G. Frazer, *Attis, Adonis, Osiris*, London, 1914.
[8] On the probability of the twinship of Balder and Hoðr cf. my study 'The Myth of Balder,' *Folk-Lore*, XXXIV, pp. 184 ff.
[9] Orph., *Argon.*, 510 ff.
[10] Kon., 41; Ephoros ap. Schol. Ap. Rhod., *Argon.*, I, 1037.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

story certainly did not originate with the narrative of the Argonauts. The connection between the two is too loose, and the episode can safely be dropped altogether without leaving a gap in the Argonaut story. Of the genesis of the Greek epic of Iason and Medeia it is known that a large number of legends localized along the shores of the Aegean, the Propontis and the Black Sea became attached to the kernel, which narrated the tragic fate of Iason and his wife and which is based on the Märchen of the *Quest of the Princess with the Golden Hair*, as I have endeavoured to show in a study forthcoming in *Folk-Lore*. While connecting the Kyzikos episode with the Argonaut epic, the re-workers of the epic material had to adopt certain precautions and modifications. Should the Argonauts have slain the kindly king wilfully, an odious light would have been shed on the heroes of the expedition. Hence the necessity of introducing the fatal error. In the original version of the Kyzikos myth, the account such as it existed before the connection with the Argonaut story, matters are likely to have happened very much as they do in the variant handed down by the scholiast; the king perishes at the hands of a hostile band of invaders who fall upon his people at night. Such a version presents a striking similarity with the end of King Fróði as narrated in the *Skáldskapermál*. Even the story of an old feud, such as is alluded to in the Norse poem, recurs in the words of the scholiast who mentions the old enmity of the Doliones and Thessalians. There exist then the following parallelisms between the myths of Kyzikos and Fróði:

1. Both are mythical kings and vegetation demons.
2. Their reign is a golden age, a time of peace and plenty.
3. This happy time suddenly ends, for
4. The good kings are killed by a hostile band of invaders from the sea.
5. According to one version recurring in both myths, those enemies are actuated or are thought to be actuated by an ancient feud.

The authors of antiquity have transmitted to us several interesting details concerning the annual festival in commemoration of Kyzikos. Its most prominent feature seems to have been a grinding festival, that is, a ceremony where all celebrants took a hand-mill and ground, accompanying their work with doleful dirges. The subject of these songs was King Kyzikos and his fatal death[1]. Grinding ceremonies of

[1] Klausen, *op. et loc. cit.* Ap. Rhod., *Argon.*, I, 1070–7:

αἰνότατον δὴ κεῖνο Δολιονίῃσι γυναιξὶν
ἀνδράσι τ' ἐκ Διὸς ἦμαρ ἐπήλυθεν· οὐδὲ γὰρ αὐτῶν

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

this nature were not peculiar to the territory of Mysia; they rather appear to have been fairly common in Greece and Asia Minor[1]. They are incidental to an agricultural population and are likely to have existed wherever religion was intimately connected with the work of the soil. There is evidence to show that they were not limited to Southern Europe and the Near East, but existed in Central and Northern Europe as well. The chroniclers of the middle ages refer to the songs which accompanied them as *cantilenae molares*, and a Swiss legend, localized at Winterthur, gives an aetiological explanation of such a local ritual, the endurance of the women who turned a hand-mill after the two regular mills had been destroyed during a siege[2]. Furthermore, songs which accompany the work on the hand-mill are found all over the earth[3], and Plutarch quotes a few lines, the fragments of an ancient mill song from Lesbos[4]:

Ἄλει, μύλα, ἄλει·
καὶ γὰρ Πιττακὸς ἄλει,
μεγάλας Μιτυλάνας βασιλεύων.

The frequent mention of the *ἐπιμύλιοι ᾠδαί* likewise shows that these songs formed a special genre of folksongs in antiquity. The common characteristic of these mill songs is a prevailing tone of sadness, not to say melancholia, which pervades them[5]. It is such a ritual attached to the god-king of the Scandinavian North which gave origin to the story of the grinding giantesses connecting Fróði's death with the work of the grinders. In other words, the myth of Fróði's mill is an aetiological myth explaining why the death of the mythical king was sung by grinding girls at the grinding festival which probably commemorated his premature end, just as did the grinding ceremonies in Mysia with regard to Kyzikos. The folktale suggested the magic quern which was held responsible for the golden age of Fróði's reign at a time when

ἔτλη τις πάσασθαι ἐδητύος, οὐ δ' ἐπι δηρὸν
ἐξ ἀχέων ἔργοιο μυληφάτου ἐμνώοντο·
ἀλλ' αὔτως ἄφλεκτα διαζώεσκον ἔδοντες.
ἔνθ' ἔτι νῦν, εὖτ' ἄν σφιν ἐτήσια χύτλα χέωνται
Κύζικον ἐννάλοντες Ἰάονες, ἔμπεδον αἰεὶ
πανδήμοιο μύλης πελανοὺς ἐπαλετρεύουσιν.

[1] Cf. the name Eleusis, possibly connected with ἁλέω, de Saussure, *Mélanges Nicole*, 1905, p. 509. The famous passage, *Od.* xx, 103 ff., was compared with the *Song of Grotti* by Von Hahn, *Mythologische Parallelen und Vergleiche*, Jena, 1859, p. 174; *Sagwissenschaftliche Studien*, p. 401. Cf. also Alcman, *Fragm.* ap. Athenaeus, *Deipn.*, iv, 140; Arist., *Lysistr.*, 644. There is also evidence that grinding rituals were connected with the worship of Adonis; cf. Liebrecht, *op. cit.*, pp. 251 ff.

[2] E. L. Rochholz, *Deutscher Glaube und Brauch im Spiegel der heidnischen Vorzeit*, Berlin, 1867, ii, pp. 322–3.

[3] K. Bücher, *Arbeit und Rhythmus*, Leipzig, 1902, pp. 57 ff.

[4] *Sept. sap. conv.*, cap. 14.

[5] Bücher, *op. cit.*, p. 86.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

imagination was no longer satisfied to take for granted such a golden age at the beginning of time and endeavoured to discover a reason for it. A necessary consequence of the grafting of this tale on the Fróði legend was the darkening of the character of the king who came to be an avaricious monarch, a feature which occurs in no other account of his reign[1]. Furthermore, the trait of the mill grinding happiness and peace is certainly the addition of a later period, more addicted to philosophical speculation[2]. The development of the myth will best be shown in a table representing the subsequent stages.

I. Legend of god-king, prince of peace in the golden age. His violent death at the hands of pirates puts an end to the time of bliss. Grinding festival in commemoration of his death. Mourning.

II. Explanation sought to account for the connection of the grinding ritual with Fróði. The happiness of Fróði's reign and his downfall attributed to grinding demons handling a magic quern.

III. The aetiological myth in its turn influences the ritual. The grinding women represent the grinding giantesses and sing a lament.

IV. In a reflective age Fróði is said to have been actuated by greed, the *auri sacra fames*. The giantesses grind abstractions instead of material treasures.

There are some more points which tend to show the identity of certain mythological clusters, if we may use this term, both in Mysia and in the Scandinavian North.

The monarch who in Saxo's work corresponds to the Fróði of Snorri is undoubtedly Frotho III, whose reign is told of at length in the fifth book of the *Gesta Danorum*. There he meets a different end; he is killed by the tusk of an evil witch who had transformed herself into a sea-cow. Saxo connects this episode with the story of the golden bracelet hung up by order of the king to testify to the honesty of the people and the golden peace of his reign[3]. We may safely reject this connection as well as the witch story, as the work of the compiler whose rationalistic tendencies are sufficiently known. We have then to start with the fact that Fróði perishes by the tusk of a wild animal. This mode of death of the vegetation demon is found, however, in the cults of the Near East, where both Attis[4] and Adonis[5] are killed by a wild boar; similarly the hero Hyleus is killed by the Calydonian boar[6], and the seer of the Argonauts, Idmon, finds the same end[7].

[1] Von der Leyen, *op. cit.*, p. 60. [2] *Ibid.*
[3] Saxo, *ed. cit.*, pp. 169–170.
[4] Gruppe, *Griechische Mythologie und Religionsgeschichte*, München, 1906, p. 1531.
[5] Frazer, *Apollodorus*, II, pp. 84–85.
[6] *Ibid.*, I, p. 69.
[7] *Ibid.*, I, p. 109; cf. also Ap. Rhod., *Argon.*, II, 815 ff.; Orph., *Argon.*, 725 ff.; Val. Flac., *Argon.*, V, 1 ff.; Hyg., *fab.* 14 and 18; Roscher, *op. cit.*, II, 1, c. 105; cf. on this subject Olrik, *op. cit.*, II, 1910, pp. 242 ff. For Swedish parallels cf. *ibid.*, p. 247.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

In the *Heimskringla* Snorri relates the death of King Fjǫlnir, one of the royal line of the Ynglings and the successor of Frey who ruled in Upsala, a contemporary of the Danish Fróði. Fjǫlnir falls into a vat of mead and is drowned[1]. The same story is told by Saxo Grammaticus who attributes it to the Swedish king Hunding[2]. No less a scholar than Ludwig Uhland[3] pointed out that this episode of the king's death was in harmony with the notion of the golden age and its sudden end. The king died of the very abundance of all good things which had made his reign a time of prosperity. The correctness of this interpretation is fully confirmed by a Swiss legend reported by E. L. Rochholz and which presents the following reading[4]:

> Die grossen Leute, die ehedem das Simmenthal bewohnten, haben einen Schlag von Rindern besessen, der für alle Ställe zu gross war, und man liess daher das Vieh stets im Freien. Jede Kuh gab des Tages drei Eimer Milch, daher molk man sie, anstatt in Gebsen, in einen Weiher. Die Treppe, die zu ihm hinab führte, war aus Käslaiben gebaut, den Anken füllte man in hohle Eichbäume. Mit Anken polierte man Hauswand und Scheunenthor, mit der Milch wusch man Geschirr und Stubenboden. In einem Einbaum fuhr man auf dem Weiher, um die Nidel abzurahmen, und warf sie mit Schaufeln statt mit der Gone ans Ufer. Bei einem grossen Sturmwinde trat dieser Milchweiher einmal aus und ersäufte die grossen Leute miteinander.

It is significant that precisely the same legend occurs in the cycle which can be considered as having King Kyzikos as its central figure. Strabo[5] relates the following story of Piasos, father of Larissa, who according to some authors was the betrothed of Kyzikos[6].

ἐν δὲ τῇ Φρικονίδε Λαρίσῃ τετιμῆσθαι λέγεται Πίασος, ὃν φασιν ἄρχοντα Πελασγῶν ἐρασθῆναι τῆς θυγατρὸς Λαρίσης, βιασάμενον δ' αὐτὴν τῖσαι τῆς ὕβρεως δίκην· ἐγκύψαντα γὰρ εἰς πίθον οἴνου καταμαθοῦσαν τῶν σκελῶν λαβομένην ἐξᾶραι καὶ καθεῖναι αὐτὸν εἰς τὸν πίθον.

The prospective father-in-law of Kyzikos dies then the same death as King Fjǫlnir in Snorri and King Hunding in the *Gesta Danorum*, as the people of the golden age in the Swiss legend.

One more feature must be brought out here, though no excessive importance can be attached to it. Saxo relates at considerable length the doings at the court of King Frotho III during that monarch's minority. Among the less pleasant facts mentioned by the chronicler the reprehensible conduct of Frotho's queen plays a conspicuous part.

[1] *Ynglinga Saga*, cap. 11. Ed. Jónsson, København, 1893–1900, I, p. 25.
[2] *Ed. cit.*, p. 36.
[3] *Schriften*, III, pp. 238, 338, 423–4; VII, pp. 111 ff.
[4] E. L. Rochholz, *op. cit.*, I, p. 22; cf. Uhland, III, p. 238.
[5] *Geogr.*, XIII, 3, 4; cf. Parth., p. 28; Suid., *ἀθέμιστα*; Marquardt, p. 41; Höfer, in Roscher, III, 2, c. 2493.
[6] Marquardt, *op. et loc. cit.*; Höfer, *art. cit.*

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

This trait appears to be quite peculiar to legends whose hero is a humanized vegetation demon, a king of the golden age. Kyzikos' betrothed is debauched by her own father[1]. A Spanish legend tells[2] of the disloyalty of the queen of Wamba, himself doubtless a vegetation demon, though identified with a historical personage[3]. King Solomon, who in Byzantine and Russian legend is the true counterpart of Fróði, a king of superhuman wisdom and renown, is not more fortunate in matters matrimonial[4], and if King Arthur and Charlemagne are made to play a similar rôle in mediaeval legend and folklore, it is not at all unlikely that the notion of their reign being a golden age, a time of peace and plenty, had something to do with it. However this may be, added to the foregoing facts, the conjecture may not be without significance. The doings at Fróði's court are very probably the reflections of the general licence so characteristic of the Saturnian age and the Saturnian festivals[5].

Inquiring into the reason of these striking similarities of the Scandinavian and Mysian legends or legendary cycles, the answer which would naturally suggest itself would be ethnographic kinship as responsible for it. No serious objections can be opposed to such an answer. The population of Mysia in historical times was a blending of races with strong Phrygian and Thracian elements. This mixture was indeed so intense that it was impossible to draw a clear demarcation line between Phrygia and Mysia[6]. The Phrygians were undoubtedly of Indo-European stock[7] and closely related to the Thracians. Identity of mythological and religious conceptions would then be the natural conclusion which would doubtless have been drawn by the mythologists of the school of Max Müller. Nevertheless, I very much hesitate to offer this explanation. The worship of the vegetation demon and god-king is met with all over the Near East, in Italy and Scandinavia, among Aryans, Semites and Egyptians. It is partly still flourishing among Mediterranean populations whose Indo-European stock is nothing less than demonstrated and who probably belong to some indigenous Mediterranean race only slightly influenced by Northern invaders[8]. Moreover, such cults and myths are closely linked up with the technique of agriculture which was

[1] Marquardt, p. 41; Höfer, *art. cit.*
[2] A. Alves, 'Algumas Tradições Populares,' *Revista Lusitana*, III, 1893, pp. 77–78; A. H. Krappe, 'The Ploughman King,' *Revue Hispanique*, XLVI, pp. 516 ff.
[3] *Ibid.* and my study 'The Ploughman King II,' *Revue Hispanique*, LVI, pp. 265–284.
[4] A. Rambaud, *La Russie épique*, Paris, 1876, p. 394.
[5] Sir J. G. Frazer, *The Scapegoat*, London, 1913, pp. 306 ff.
[6] Marquardt, p. 40.
[7] Maspéro, *op. cit.*, p. 241.
[8] M. K. Lübeck, *Adoniskult und Christentum auf Malta*, Fulda, 1894.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

certainly not invented independently in different regions of Europe and the Mediterranean basin, but was very probably transmitted from people to people. Under these circumstances O. Gruppe's theory of the migration of cults and myths[1] appears to be infinitely more probable in this case.

In concluding it might be well to emphasize on how frail a basis all researches of this nature must necessarily rest, as data are sorely lacking to guide the investigator through the maze of traditions often contradictory. All he can do at best is to group his facts under a viewpoint which appears to be justified and in accordance with facts and data brought to light by others, in various fields. New finds, archaeological and anthropological, will doubtless correct many errors. In the meantime, what can be asserted with a fair degree of probability would be that the *Song of Grotti* owes its origin to an ancient grinding ritual such as we know was practised in Greece and the Near East, that the Norse Fróði is a vegetation demon, closely akin to Kyzikos, Adonis and others, and that his reign, the golden age of peace and plenty, came to a sudden end, either by a band of foreign invaders, or through his own death by the tusk of a wild animal, while both in the North and in Mysia there existed also a tradition according to which another figure, likewise a vegetation demon or connected with such a one, found his death by drowning in a vessel of mead or wine. The story of the disloyalty of Fróði's queen as told by Saxo has parallels elsewhere, which suggests that the domestic misfortunes of the Norse king are probably not fortuitous, but in line with his character of a Saturnian king[2].

ALEXANDER HAGGERTY KRAPPE.

FLAT RIVER, MO., U.S.A.

[1] O. Gruppe, *Die griechischen Kulte und Mythen in ihren Beziehungen zu den orientalischen Religionen*, Leipzig, 1887.

[2] When I wrote this study I had not as yet read the work of Miss Bertha S. Phillpotts, *The Elder Edda and Ancient Scandinavian Drama*, Cambridge, 1920. Her views on the most salient points of this line of research so closely concur with mine that I do not doubt but that added weight is given thereby to the thesis here defended.

Digitized by Google

Original from
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES.

The Source of a Passage in Byrhtferð's 'Handboc' (A.D. 1011).

There is an interesting passage in Byrhtferð's *Handboc*, printed by Kluge in *Anglia*, VIII, 325, which reminds one of the beginning of *Paradise Lost*. The source of this passage does not appear in Classen's admirable dissertation on Byrhtferð. Professor Toller (*A. S. Dict. Sup.* s.v. *ceddran*) hesitatingly suggests *Isaiah* vi for part of it, but in this he is mistaken. The whole passage is a somewhat loose translation of a portion of Aldhelm's *De Laudibus Virginum* (Migne, 89, col. 239).

The passage from Byrhtferð runs as follows:

Ic háte gewitan fram me þa mære men þe synt *sirene* geciged, 7 eac þa castalidas nymphas, *þæt* synt dúnylfa, þa þe wunedon on elicona þære dune; 7 ic wylle *þæt mater* sol*is* (mater apollonis) 7 diane, latona, þære sunnan moder 7 apollonis 7 diane, fram me gewíten, þe delo akende, þæsðe ealde swæmas gecyddon. 7 ic hopige *þæt* cherubin se mæra ætwesan wylle 7 of þam upplican weofode mid his gyldenan tange þære gledan spearcan to minre tungan gebringan 7 þæs dumbes muðes *æddran* æthrinan, þæt ic for þam mæge argute arguto meditamine fari.
MS. sinere. MS. ater. MS. ceddran.

Here is the original:

Non rogo ruricolas versus, et commata Musas
Nec peto Castalidas metrorum cantica nymphas,
Quas dicunt Helicona jugum servare supernum,
Nec precor ut Phoebus linguam sermone loquacem
Dedat, quem Delo peperit Latona creatrix.
Versibus infandis nam nunquam dicere dignor,
Ut quondam argutus fertur dixisse poeta:
Scandite nunc Helicona Deæ, cantusque movete,
Sed potius nitar precibus pulsare Tonantem,
Qui nobis placidi confert oracula verbi.

* * * * * * *

Quis poterit digne rerum mysteria nosse,
Aut abstrusa Dei gnaro cognoscere sensu?
Torridus altaris ni sumptus forcipe carbo,
Calculus aut ardens emundet spurca labella,
Quo cherubin quondam purgavit labra prophetæ,
Ut merito deinceps cælesti famine flagrans
Egregius doctor verbi claustella resolvat.

S. J. Crawford.

Southampton.

Digitized by Google

Original from
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Chaucer's 'Pardoner's Prologue.'

There is a difficulty in Chaucer's account of the Pardoner, on which no edition known to me offers any comment.

It is obvious that Chaucer intends to accentuate his utter unscrupulousness:

> I rekke never, whan that they ben beryed
> Though that her soules goon a blakeberyed;

and disregard of any possible limitations to the universal efficacy of his nostrums:

> Let maken (the jealous husband) with this water his potage,
> And never shal he more his wyfe mistriste,
> Though he the soth of hir defaute wiste.

He was out simply and solely to make money. We expect him to claim, as Tetzel, for instance, did (Skeat on C 387), that his relics expiate not only ordinary sins, for which the ministrations of the parish priest would suffice, but the most heinous and unutterable wickedness, which a man would shrink from disclosing in confession. So strong is this expectation, that Morley in his abstract (*Eng. Writers*, v, 303) actually writes 'Those guilty of the worst sins may buy absolution.'

This is precisely what we should all expect the Pardoner to say; what he does say is:

> Good men and wommen, o thing warne I yow,
> If any wight be in this chirche now,
> That hath doon sinne horrible, that he
> Dar not for shame of it y-shriven be,
> Or any womman, be she yong or old,
> That hath y-maad hir housbond cokewold,
> Swich folk shul have no power ne no grace
> To offren to my reliks in this place;
> And[1] whoso fyndeth him out of swich blame,
> They wol com up and offre in goddes name,
> And I assoille hem.

What is the meaning of this amazing restriction? The only explanation must be that the warning was only part of the Pardoner's cunning, and not seriously meant. His idea apparently was that none would virtually confess, before the whole parish, to living in deadly sin, by holding back from making an offering. *The Pardoner was simply forcing their hand.*

That this explanation is correct (in spite of Chaucer's unusual reticence and brevity) is indicated by the M.H.G. poem of the Pfaffe Ameis—who, incidentally, is made an Englishman. Ameis is about to show St Brandan's head and make a collection, but the Saint has warned him:

[1] I do not understand this *and*: we expect *but*.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

...dasz ich nie ein Opfer nehm'—
Gebot er mir bei meinem Leib—,
Das mir verleihen wollt' ein Weib,
Die zu ihrem Ehemann
Einen andern je gewann.
Drum, die noch Nebenmänner haben,
Enthalten sich der Opfergaben !

. . . . . .

Allda begannen denn die Frauen

. . . . . .

Mit Gaben schnell heran zu dringen.

. . . . . .

Die heimlich einen Mann genommen
Und aus der Leute Mund wollt' kommen,
Die brachte *öfter* Opfer dar,
Damit den Leuten würde klar,
Dasz sie ganz frei von Untreu' wäre
Und keusch und rein und voller Ehre.

(Modernised by K. Pannier. Ed. Reclam, vv. 380 ff.)

This is early thirteenth century; I do not know of any source common to Chaucer and the German version; both seem in general to be drawing on their own experience, but this particular trick may well have been the subject of popular stories. Chaucer may have got a hint from the *Decamerone* (6. 10) but the resemblances are slight.

W. B. SEDGWICK.

LEICESTER.

'GUY OF WARWICK.'

Reviewing Professor Gustav Schleich's edition of this romance (*M. L. R.*, XIX, 222) Mr Cowling remarks that the editor 'has not even discovered the present locality of "Mr Locker-Lampson's copy," though he surmises that it is now in the British Museum under press-mark C 18. e 1. (49) IA 55,533; surely a postcard would have decided this important point.' This is I think putting it mildly; and, since the reviewer has not decided the point either, a brief note on the matter may be useful. A little bibliographical knowledge is often helpful to literary students, and it would not have been amiss here: the press-mark IA 55,533 indicates a fifteenth-century book, and the volume in question therefore could not be William Copland's edition, which was printed not earlier than 1562. It is, in fact, a fragment of three leaves from an edition by Pynson of about 1500. That the editor should have printed from a thirty-year-old transcript without making any endeavour to ascertain whether the original was accessible shows an astonishing—though unhappily not unexampled—disregard of the requirements of modern scholarship. I ought, however, to add that, whatever one may think of Professor Schleich's treatment of the text, Zupitza's transcript

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

of the Museum copy appears to have been commendably accurate. One would like to think that Furnivall's transcript of the Locker-Lampson copy was equally trustworthy. Unfortunately there is some reason to suppose that Furnivall's errors were six times as numerous as Zupitza's, and averaged about three in every hundred lines.

W. W. Greg.

London.

The Fairy Scene in 'The Merry Wives' in Folio and Quarto.

In his edition of Shakespeare's *Merry Wives* of 1602 in the Tudor and Stuart Library, Oxford, 1910, Dr W. W. Greg gives for the first time a thorough explanation of the masquerade scene in the *Merry Wives*. He does away with the seeming contradiction between the announcement that Anne Page is to be the Fairy Queen and the actual appearance of Mrs Quickly as such, which so many editors, English as well as German, have taken exception to. 'The part of Queen,' he explains, 'is just the one part which Anne cannot possibly take if she is to make good her escape with Fenton.' On the other hand her part is as a matter of fact not taken by Mrs Quickly, to whom nobody in the course of the scenes alludes; but it is only the same boy, who fills the part of Mrs Quickly and the 'Postmaster's-boy' (v, 5, 211), who appears as Fairy Queen here, just as another fairy is called Pistol, i.e. is acted by the same actor that represents the braggarding ancient. All this is plausible. Also he is certainly right not to attach undue importance to the fact that some colours are wrongly attributed in the text. Even to 'a rather wooden mind' it will be clear that much light falls from these notes of Greg on a hitherto dark passage. Still it seems not quite convincing that at the end (p. 92) the Folio version is—in contradistinction to the Quarto—in respect to this scene looked upon as 'most elaborate (except for the omission of the stage-direction) and, but for the easily corrected errors of Act v, as *entirely consistent*.' (Italics mine.)

It is perhaps not impossible to point out a few difficulties in the Folio version, that have not been removed by Greg.

1. When the masquerade is decided upon, Mrs Page says:

> My Nan shall be the queen of all the fairies,
> Finely attired in a robe of white.

In accordance with this, Fenton tells the host:

> ... Must my sweet Anne present the Fairy Queen.

Later on, however, the idea of her acting the Fairy Queen is not mentioned again. Slender arranges a nay-word with Anne and speaks about

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

her coming in white. The fact of her being in white is laid particular stress on by Shallow: 'The white will decipher her well enough.' But if her father wants her and expects her to act the Fairy Queen, one would think that she would wear a crown or other insignia, which would make her distinctly recognisable to Slender. Why then does nobody mention this to him? Why does the stage-direction of the Folio not speak of a Fairy Queen at all? Why at the dénouement does Slender not say a word of the Fairy Queen with whom he has been running away—a rather noteworthy thing!—but only of '*her in white*'?

2. It seems a bit curious that Fenton should give to the host a detailed description of the green robe which Mrs Page intends her daughter Anne to wear:

> She shall be loose enrobed
> With ribands pendant, flaring 'bout her head

if she is sure *not* to wear this green robe. For what should the public care to hear about a robe which does not serve to make them recognise her?

3. Why do we not hear anything about Anne's real mask? What does she do to escape her mother's plans? What kind of robe has she on and how is the public to recognise her on the stage? Modern theatre practice shows that this point presents the most serious difficulties. At the Weimar Theatre for instance some years ago the stage-direction: 'and Fenton comes and steals away Mrs Anne Page' was put into practice by making Anne suddenly turn up undisguised among the others, where she was met by Fenton, they both running away together. Improbable as this solution from the point of view of the interpretation of the text is, it offers at least the advantage of not keeping the public in the dark about what is going on.

Now Dr Greg thinks that here the Quarto is of use. He says '*The only service rendered by the quarto* (the italics are mine) is the record of the third colour—red—presumably worn by Anne (the folio nowhere mentions her colour...).' But I do not think that the difficulty the Folio presents in this case is overcome by Anne's wearing *a colour nobody has heard a word about in all preceding scenes.* Nor does the remark seem to me to be quite just to the Quarto. The Quarto in fact does give the whole 'missing link.' For here (Greg's ed., p. 50) Fenton explains to the host that Slender will take a fairy in white for her, and abduct her, Caius a fairy in red, and in reality she will run away with himself. Whereupon the host replies:

> *But how will you come to steale her from among them?*

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

A most appropriate question indeed! Fenton answers it and here we get the solution of the crux Number 2 at the same time. For he says:

> That hath sweet Nan and I agreed upon
> And by a robe of white, the which she weares,
> *With ribones pendant flaring 'bout her head*
> I shalbe sure to know her.

So shall the public! There can be little doubt that the same verse that appeared so superfluous in the Folio is at its right and original place here. Something is necessary to make the public know when the fairy masquerade takes place, under what disguise 'sweet Anne Page' is hidden. It is just the 'pendant ribones flaring 'bout her head' that make her unmistakable. That the Quarto falls into the same error as the Folio in other passages does, as regards the colours, is here of an importance not greater than there. It is true that they are all wrong. There is a great confusion as to who is clad in green, red and white. But these errors are easily corrected, exactly as in the Folio v, 5, 186, 190, 196, by changing just one word. I do not think therefore that one can say with Greg: 'that the data of the quarto are throughout confused and corrupt.' On the contrary, the text of the Quarto creates a clear situation with its three colours and its answering the question what Anne is to wear, when the Folio leaves us entirely in the dark.

As to point 1, too, the Quarto seems more consistent. It does not speak of a 'Fairy Queen' at all, though the stage-direction mentions her, but Anne Page is from the very beginning only 'disguised...like a little Fayrie.'

These things are not without a certain interest with regard to the much-discussed question of the relation between Quarto and Folio. They strengthen the position of the Quarto and—to say the least—do not contradict the new theory as to the origin of the *Merry Wives* put forth by Messrs Pollard and Wilson in the *Times Lit. Suppl.* Aug. 7, 1919.

LEVIN L. SCHÜCKING.

BRESLAU.

MR W. J. LAWRENCE AND PETER CUNNINGHAM.

Mr W. J. Lawrence having chosen to disapprove of my pamphlet, *The Seventeenth Century Accounts of the Masters of the Revels* (see p. 25 above), I have been allowed to answer his main points. I had no intention of 'challenging' him, when I protested against his using as 'proof' of one statement Cunningham's disproved invention. I have spent long work to search after the truth, he tries to prove the innocence of a person. He does not go to work in the right way. Peter

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Cunningham might look upon a forgery as a colossal practical joke, but if Mr Lawrence could prove him innocent of concocting one, he indirectly charges him with *converting to his own use*, with selling, and trying to sell, the property of the Crown. I leave aside the personal question. Mr Lawrence opens his contention by blaming me for over-estimating discrepancies between the Declared Accounts and the Revels Books in question. 'The old Revels Clerks had a prime capacity for blundering.... Luckily for poor Peter Cunningham's reputation,' he says, Professor Wallace, in his *Evolution of the English Drama*, noted 'all the serious disagreements' they made; 'Six blunders within seven years is a fairly good record.' I looked these up. Most of them are mere slips between the different days of Shrovetide; only one of them cannot be accounted for by associated ideas. Only one of them is of any importance, anyone could have made them, at any time, none would affect history or finance. Six in seven years is a very low estimate for error, and these were all committed in the sixteenth century, which 'poor Peter Cunningham' did not touch. He spent his strength on the seventeenth century. There, on one occasion in 1605, and another occasion in 1612, he committed in each entry blunders *which could not have been committed by any contemporary scribe.*

Cunningham did not know that the accounts of the Grooms of the Chamber, who went before the King to prepare his rooms for him, would throw any light on the Revels. But they often do so. And they are all the more to be trusted because they are rendered *directly* to the Lord Chamberlain himself. Hence arose some of Cunningham's errors.

Revels Book 1604–5, Item No. 6. When I show that 'The Boys of the Chapel' was a mistake for 'The Children of the Queen's Revels,' Mr Lawrence charges me with 'inaccuracy' in alluding to 'Rosseter' in 1605. It is he who is inaccurate. I did not speak of Rosseter as playing then, but *in the following year*. Unfortunately my eyes have completely failed me now, and I have not been able to search *my own notes* for the reference to my authority. Every one knows from the Declared Accounts that Philip Rosseter was performing with the Children of the Chapel in 1612.

Item No. 7. Mr Lawrence makes no allusion to this *great bungle*, 'Betwin New [Y]ers Day and Twelfe Day.' No other Revels document uses the phrase *between* any two dates. On this occasion the King's Men did not play between these dates, and consequently *Love's Labour's Lost* could not have been played *at Court*. It was, however, played that season after the King had left town, in Southampton House, before the

Digitized by Google Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Queen and her brother, on January 12th. The Earl does not charge the King for it; noblemen and Societies often *gave* Royalty a play, which accounts for some extra ones. The only reference which Mr Lawrence makes to this entry (sufficient in itself to prove a forgery) is to try to prove me wrong over a fresh piece of evidence. The King's Men did not play between these dates, the men who usually *helped* did not help then. After the Charges for the Wire-drawers is a half-page of helpers: 'Allowed to six men attending to the servis att Whitehall...16/.... To six men on New Yeres Day att 16d the pece...8/. To six men att Twelfe Eve and Twelfe Day 16/. To four men on Monday and Tuesday following 10/8.' I had discovered that the 'Children of the Revels,' i.e. (Item No. 6) had performed on January 3rd the unsatisfactory performance which made an end of them, and also that there was *no help given to them* as to the men's companies. Thereafter Mr Lawrence wanders off into a series of mis-statements which throw doubt on his carefulness. For the third of January was 'Betwin' these dates.

The Revels Book for 1611–12 should have begun with a play on October 31st. Item No. 1, on November 1st, was the *second* play; Cunningham *says* it was *The Tempest*.

Item No. 3. The Declared Accounts credit the Prince's Players with two performances and payments; Cunningham allows them only one.

Item No. 6. The King's Players did not play that night, as the list says, but on the Sunday following, which Cunningham gave to the Children of Whitefriars, who did not play that season at all.

Item No. 8. This is the second *great bungle*, which is of itself sufficient to prove forgery somewhere: 'By the Queens Players and the Kings Players. The Sunday following (i.e. the 12th) at Grinwidge, before the Queen and the prince was played The Silver Aiedg and ye next night following Lucrecia.' From Chamberlain's letter of January 15th, we know that neither the Queen nor the Prince had reached Greenwich by Sunday, January 12th. The Prince was that night seeing a play in London with his brother and sister. The Groom of the Chamber prepared first the Queen's own rooms, then the King's rooms for her, then the rooms for the Princess. There was *no* preparation for a play till February 'in the great Chamber.' Mr Lawrence misreads Heywood's Address to the Reader in *The Iron Age*; Heywood distinctly refers to two companies but only to public acting in three Theatres—no reference to a Court performance. Mr Lawrence, however, finds Malone's note in his copy of *The Silver Age*. 'This play was performed at Greenwich..." by the Queen's Players and the King's men"....' It was *not* played on

Digitized by Google

Original from
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

January 12th, not in January at all, unless the improbable happened. The Prince joined the King at Royston on January 29th; the Groom of the Chamber did not prepare 'the Great Chamber for the King to see a play' until February. Against all these facts Mr Lawrence would establish the genuineness of the Revels Book because of Item No. 11, the performance of *Hymen's Holiday* on Shrove Monday. The other references to this play are late; Fleay gives no definite date for its appearance, but proves it was by Will Rowley. Mr Lawrence does not note that Will Rowley, in charge of the Duke of York's Company, helped to prove the *alibi* for the Prince on January 12th, 1612, the day that Cunningham fixed him at Greenwich.

I am also found in fault for calling the third group of papers a Revels Book. I did so because it was always called so before I began to work at it; I continued to do so as it was simpler to use the general name; and I make perfectly clear the distinctions between the three loose documents. It is of much less interest than the two others, as it is after Shakespeare's date. The list alone can be suspected, but there are solid grounds for suspicion. I cannot go through these now. Mr Lawrence asserts that my paper is full of errors and worse. He does not specify them. My sight is not able now to check my careful old work. There are two points, however, which should be discussed, as the arguments for and against them seem about equal. Both concern *The Royal Slave.* Mr Lawrence says that he first tells its story correctly; he forgets that it was I who first published the story of the Lord Chamberlain's expenses over its production by the King's Players in the *Jahrbuch*, 1910, under the title, *Shakespeare's Fellows and Followers.* The only new thing that he contributes is the denial of the authority of Archbishop Laud's Diary. Knowing the special relation in which Laud stood to this production, we do not feel justified in denying his statements. It seems more likely that the Queen's Men did try to perform it, as Laud says, that they failed in the *ordinary way*, and that the King took it up and lavished unusual expense to make it a success. Since I published my pamphlet, Herbert's lost Diary has been recovered, and he supports what I thought was an error of Malone's. But still, in the estimation of evidence, I feel that Edward Rossingham's letter of January 11th, 1637, saying that it *had been performed* on Twelfth Night, and written from the midst of the Court gossip about it, in *the Historical past*, cannot be ignored, even on sight of Herbert's irregular journal.

LONDON. CHARLOTTE CARMICHAEL STOPES.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Mrs Stopes absolves me from the necessity of making detailed reply by confining herself almost wholly to an iteration of her old contentions. Elizabethan scholars will unite with me in deploring the affliction which has come upon her. Malone in his declining years had similar trouble with his eyesight and his work suffered accordingly. The misfortune is that error remains error, no matter what the circumstances in which it is committed. The case must now go to the jury.

W. J. Lawrence.
Monkstown,
County Dublin.

Coleridge Marginalia on Wieland and Schiller.

In the London *Athenæum* for March 24, 1860 (p. 409), Sir Matthew Digby Wyatt[1] printed, under the heading 'Coleridgeana,' some interesting notes, signed 'S. T. C.,' written in a volume of Wieland's *Comische Erzählungen* belonging to Rolandi's Circulating Library in 1860. Wyatt quotes notes written 'at the foot of the 20th and 21st pages of the volume,' but strange to say he does not in any way indicate the edition referred to; so that these page-numbers do not suffice to identify the precise printed passage to which these notes refer.

By chance I now own what evidently was originally the first-half of that very volume, the second-half of which seems to have disappeared since Wyatt saw it. My book is an octavo, uncut, bound in plain grey boards, with simple wine-coloured cloth back without lettering. On the front cover is pasted a green label of 'Rolandi's French, Italian, German, & Spanish Circulating Library consisting of upwards of 300,000 Volumes in Ancient and Modern Foreign Literature...20, Berners St., Oxford St., London,' and inside the cover is a somewhat similar yellow label giving the number of volumes as 'upwards of 25,000'—which shows that Rolandi had the books for many years. His Library no longer exists.

Probably that lost second-half no longer contained its own title-page when Wyatt saw it in 1860; but my Rolandi copy of the first-half still has the general half-title (A 1) to both parts, reading:—'Sammlung / der / poetischen und prosaischen / Schriften / der / schöneu Geister / in

[1] The article in the *Athenæum* is signed merely 'M. D. W.'; but his address is given as '54, Guildford Street,' and a glance at Watkins' *Commercial and General Directory* (e.g. 1855) does the rest. However the writer remains merely 'M. D. W.' under no. 335, in the useful but by no means exhaustive list of 341 'Marginalia,' in J. L. Haney's *Bibliography of S. T. Coleridge* (Philadelphia, 1903, 330 copies, privately printed), where Rolandi's name is misprinted 'Ronaldi.'

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Deutschland./Enthaltend/Wielands Idris/und/Comische Erzählungen.'/ And I have also a copy of both parts still bound together and containing the original separate title-page 'Comische Erzählungen/[motto from Horace, Ars Poet. 240/1]/[ornament]/Mit Röm. Kayserl. Allergnädigsten Privilegio./Reuttlingen,/bey Joh. Georg Fleischhauer. 1785.'/*without the author's name*, 175 pages, in eights. No doubt the copy annotated by S. T. C. and used by Wyatt was originally just like this one, in which pages 20–21 bear lines 273–312 of 'Das Urtheil des Paris,' the first poem in the volume; followed by: 'Endymion' (pp. 43–76), 'Juno und Ganymed' (pp. 77–124), and 'Aurora und Cephalus' (pp. 125–175). With characteristic inaccuracy Coleridge speaks of 'the last poem' and then of the '4 preceding tales.' There are but four in all, really.

My Rolandi book described in part above has still its separate title-page: 'Idris/Ein/Heroisch-comisches Gedicht./Fünf Gesänge./Von Herrn Wieland./[ornament]/Mit...Privilegio./Reuttlingen,/...1785.'/ as above, 198 pages *counting* the general half-title to both parts (quoted above). There are no manuscript notes in the text, but on the blank leaf (N 4) facing the last printed page (198) is the following, evidently in the handwriting of Coleridge, though unsigned: 'I concede to the Poets of Faery Tales a full exemption from Chronology & Geography/they have a right to live and move thro' Abstract Space, and in *mere* Time/So [it] is with Spencer, and so with the Arab. Nights Ent:/but I cannot allow a *wanton* & systematic Insult (as Rulers, Van Dyk, the Druids, &c., &c., all higgledy-piggledy) for this destroys *all* Illusion.'

Further I have also another similar Rolandi volume entitled: 'Wielands/Neueste Gedichte./vom Jahre 1770 bis 1777./Neue, verbesserte Auflage./Mit...Privilegio./Reuttlingen,/...1780.'/ (368 pp. *not* counting this title-page and the preceding half-title: 'Sammlung....Deutschland./ Enthaltend/Wielands neueste Gedichte.'/, showing that it appeared alone). (It should be noted that in spite of the 'Privilegium' of the Holy Roman Empire, these are in fact pirated editions issued against the wishes of the authors and their own publishers.) On the paste-down inside the back cover Coleridge wrote in ink (a few letters have been defaced, probably in repairing the binding): '221. O how vile a sacrilege [is] rash abridgement!—Not to [m]ention the terrific witness of [the] three baffled Oaths in the original Tale, the lucky Stratagem of the Fisherman, which blends such a human Interest in the Tale & lifts up Humanity from its prostration before physical Force, nor even the truly sublime moment when the Genius Spurns the Chest into the Ocean—the simple disturbance or rather subversion of the *Character*

Digitized by Google Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

of an evil and rebellious Spirit, which is so finely sustained in the Original, and the Meanness of the reward by Wieland left [un]explained & inexplicable, but [by] the Arabian Poet formed in perfect [con]-sequence & harmony—should have precluded the very Thought [of] this butcherly Excision.' In retelling the well-known Story of the Fisherman from the *Arabian Nights* Wieland had, in 'Das Wintermärchen. Erster Theil. Der Fischer und der Geist' (p. '221' begins: 'Mich Solomon—nicht überwand—' and ends: 'An einem See, der, wie ein Spiegel'), made the changes which Coleridge condemns. The jinn or 'Genius' Eblis introduces himself to the fisherman, at once tells him that he will make him happy, leads him to the lake, and then says merely:

> Hier sollst du was zu fischen haben !...
> Doch merks : nur einmal jeden Morgen !
> Gehorch ! sonst wirst des Todes seyn !

He was not, by stratagem, induced to re-enter the chest, and he had not threatened the fisherman at all, but was very friendly and grateful from the first.

These notes by Coleridge in connection with works by Wieland now practically forgotten may be followed here by his comment on a really great work in which he as translator took a deep interest, namely, Schiller's *Wallenstein*. That comment written in a copy of his translation (1800) was to be sure printed in 1834, in the cumbersome sale catalogue (Pt. IV, lot 2307, Dec. 20) of the vast library of Richard Heber, but it seems to have hitherto escaped notice, and is well worth exhuming. Coleridge says: 'The great main moral of this Play is the Danger of dallying with evil Thoughts under the influence of superstition, as did Wallenstein; and the grandeur of perfect Sincerity in Max Piccolomini, and the unhappy effects of Insincerity, tho' for the best purposes, in his Father Octavio.'

LEONARD L. MACKALL.

SAVANNAH, GA., U.S.A.

SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE ON 'THE FRISIAN POEMS IN TITIA BRONGERSMA'S BRONSWAAN.'

Since the publication of the above article in the January number of the *Modern Language Review*, Professor Craigie has kindly drawn my attention to an article in Frisian by Dr Wumkes in *It Heitelân* (March 1st, 1924, pp. 99–101) on Titia Brongersma, in which the four Frisian poems appear in modernized orthography and punctuated.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

This new edition enables me to clear up the following points which puzzled me, viz. in the first poem, p. 88, l. 4, *wijk in* is best taken as *wijken* (plural); in the second poem, p. 90, l. 12 runs—if modernized —*Sjuch, ik tsjuch wol op'e rin*, i.e. 'I shall run away,' and l. 31 *mey jins kroantsje* 'with your golden necklace' (or rather 'gold pendant and bead necklace'); in the third, p. 93, l. 15, *in reuwe* 'and harness' and *Swetseman* in 13 is taken as a proper noun. Dr Wumkes concludes his article with a reference to the *Drentsche Volksalmanaak*, 1868, and the *Nieuw Nederl. Biogr. Woordenboek*, IV, p. 316.

W. E. COLLINSON.

LIVERPOOL.

Digitized by Google

Original from
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

REVIEWS.

Histoire de la Langue Anglaise. Tome I. *Des Origines à la Conquête normande.* Par RENÉ HUCHON. Paris: Armand Colin. 1923. xii + 327 pp. 20 fr.

This is an admirable book, which I have great pleasure in recommending to all serious students of Old English. It has all the good qualities that we are accustomed to find in works emanating from the French school of linguistic science headed by M. Meillet: full knowledge of the works of previous scholars, independent research and criticism, combined with a lucid arrangement, which allows a presentment of a great many details in such a way that the reader never loses sight of the great broad lines of development. The writer has been, as he says himself, 'préoccupé avant tout d'apporter quelque clarté et quelque vie dans un sujet qui reste, quoi qu'on fasse, trop souvent aride et technique'—let me say at once that he has succeeded completely in both respects. I have read the whole volume with the greatest interest and have only found very little to criticize, curiously enough most in the first chapter, which deals with the pre-history of English, while the chapters dealing with the historical periods of Old English leave very little to desire.

The first sound-shift, which the writer persists in terming 'Grimm's Law,' is not correctly formulated: it is wrong to say that 'elle présuppose que les consonnes ainsi modifiées appartenaient à des syllabes portant l'accent principal indo-européen.' On the contrary, it took place everywhere: *p* became *f* both in Gothic *faihu*, where it was in the stressed syllable, and in *fadar*, where it was unstressed; and thus also with the other consonants. Evidently Professor Huchon's mistake is due to his wish to treat together the first shift and Verner's law; he even thinks it possible to give one comprehensive formula for both. But I must confess that I am utterly at a loss from a phonetic point of view to understand the explanation given p. 16: 'en germanique, l'accent intensifie l'expiration, mais l'expiration contrarie la voix, et réciproquement. C'est pourquoi les sonores aspirées, gardant leur caractère de momentanées sonores, perdirent peu à peu l'expiration; c'est pourquoi aussi les sonores simples indo-européennes, nécessairement influencées par l'accent expiratoire germanique, eurent une tendance à s'assourdir en acquérant plus ou moins, selon les dialectes, la qualité d'aspirées.' In this, and in the remarks following, I see a lingering effect of the unfortunate term 'aspiration,' which has contributed more than most things to obscure these matters. On p. 17 we read about ð becoming *d* as in O.E. *fæder*: 'gardant sa sonorité, c'est-à-dire sa voix, elle perd son aspiration,' but what happened was simply

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

that the tip of the tongue instead of merely approaching the teeth or gum came into contact with them, a change which has nothing to do with 'aspiration' or expiration or stress. In the passage quoted above it is said that 'les sonores aspirées' lost the 'expiration'—but surely the sounds remained expiratory (i.e. pronounced while air is driven out of the lungs); and even the supposition that *expiration* is a misprint for *aspiration* does not help us. The unvoicing of original *b*, *d*, *g* is totally independent of stress (exactly as the unvoicing of the mediae aspiratae in Greek ϕ, θ, χ), and if according to Verner's discovery original *p*, *t*, *k* appear in two different shapes, determined by the place of the accent, the only natural explanation is that we have two sound changes independent of one another and probably separated by centuries, one consisting in the opening of the contact in the upper organs, independent of stress, and the other retaining the articulation in the upper organs, but changing that of the vocal chords by an assimilation to voiced surroundings, which took place if the preceding vowel was not strongly stressed. That the latter change had no connection with the former is also evident from the fact that it seized the consonant *s*, which had not been changed by the first shift. If we take this view, we are not only in perfect agreement with Verner's own statements, but also with sound phonetic theory.

The following chapters contain a lucid exposition of the principal facts of O.E. phonology and morphology. Why is *h* said to be 'affaibli en *k*' (p. 33)? and what is 'l'accent quantitatif' (p. 34)? In nearly all cases, Proto-Aryan (Indo-European) and Primitive Germanic forms are adduced to explain Old English, and where the construction of these forms is not perfectly certain, doubt is not suppressed, so that one has the feeling of a firm foothold throughout. (The explanation of the vowel in *mæton* suggested cautiously on p. 83 seems to rest on mistaken linguistic psychology.)

In Chapter IV we have a very instructive treatment of the O.E. vocabulary, both native and borrowed, in which full justice is done to the resources of native word-formation, with very full word-lists. Then follow, in the second part (Les caractères généraux de la langue) first a chapter on the dialects, which are characterized by means of carefully selected and annotated specimens, next one on the syntax and style of O.E. prose, and finally one on O.E. poetry. All this, which takes up about two-thirds of the volume, is admirably done, 'nourri de faits,' as the French say, and full of illuminating remarks which show a fine appreciation of the literary merits as well as of the shortcomings of the old language. If I were to find fault with anything here, it would be with the three pages given to metre: Cædmon's lines 'Nu sculun hergan,' etc. are a very poor specimen and do not show Old English versification at its best. For the rest of the chapter I have only unstinted praise.

Here and there the notes contain shrewd and often very happily worded criticism of previous theories; e.g. p. 305 on Barnouw's chronology of O.E. poetry based on the use of weak adjectives ('Autant

Digitized by Google Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

d'affirmations et de précisions hasardées, pour lesquelles, sauf pour Maldon, on apporte à peine un commencement de preuve!') and p. 254 on Dahlstedt ('travail très minutieux, mais d'une composition si obscure que nous n'en avons pu tirer aucune indication utile'); cf. also pp. 303 and 307.

Huchon's book, which is likely to prove a standard work for a long time to come, should be made more easily accessible through an English translation.

OTTO JESPERSEN.
COPENHAGEN.

Vermischte Beiträge zur englischen Sprachgeschichte (*Etymologie, Ortsnamenkunde, Lautlehre*). By OTTO RITTER. Halle: Max Niemeyer. 1922. xi + 219 pp. 7 M.

In these papers Dr Ritter makes contributions to various fields of English philological learning, but the most important undoubtedly are those made to English place-name lore. They consist partly in detailed studies of some of the chief place-name books that have appeared in England during the last few years, and partly in examples (with excursus on various subjects) of a revised *Flurnamenbuch* which he has in preparation, but which it is impossible to complete or publish in the present condition of the world of scholarship in Germany.

These papers undoubtedly constitute the most valuable direct contribution to English place-name studies which has come to us from Germany. They owe this value to more than one cause. First, their author knows his O.E. charter material in most thorough fashion, as for example when he suspects that Wenforton, Worc., contains the O.E. river-name *Wenferþ* found in Birch, no. 513. As a matter of fact that charter does really belong to the Wenforton district, and Ritter's surmise is quite correct. Next, he brings very happily into evidence the comparative material drawn from the continent—material the value of which we are only just beginning to realise—as in his treatment of the difficult *Staver-* names in English, where he quotes various continental parallels, and finds an English cognate of the Danish *staver*, 'stake,' or in that of the English *Hunger-* names for which he finds numerous analogies in continental usage.

In two excursus he provides the clue to a large group of difficult names and settles a vexed question of toponymics. The clue is that to be found in the recognition that in place-name compounds of three elements, the middle one may often be lost. With this clue, a name which now yields little sense or only a difficult one may become easy of explanation. Thus O.E. *Dornceaster* is from *Dorn(wara)ceaster*; *hunigweg* appears also in the fuller form *hunig wiellæs weg*. The vexed question is that of the existence in O.E. place-nomenclature of compounds in which the first element is in the genitive case. By a host of quotations from the charters, he shows that such compounds as *stanmereshlinc*,

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

mercecumbes æwielm, wudanhammes broc are quite common and must receive their full recognition in place-name etymologies.

At times one must disagree with Ritter's conclusions. It is impossible to explain the difficult *Dray-* names by association with the word *dray*, 'fishing-net,' for many of them are names of places right away from water. Petworth cannot contain O.E. *pytt*, for it is *Peartinga-wyrþ* (Birch, no. 262). The Hertfordshire *Beane* cannot be quoted as a river-name which may lie behind some of the O.E. examples of *Beanstede*, for that river is *Beneficce* in the Chronicle. The river Leam, Warw., for which Ritter quotes the parallel form *Leomene* from Kemble, no. 751, is actually to be identified with that river. The whole story of Ufton, Warw., has been vitiated by the acceptance of Duignan's quotation from Dugdale of the form *Ulfetone* from a charter of Earl Leofric. That charter is not an original eleventh-century document, but a thirteenth-century confirmation, and the form *Ulfetone* has come from an earlier *Ulchetone*.

The whole book is stimulating and suggestive, and it is much to be hoped that Dr Ritter may be encouraged to continue his place-name studies.

ALLEN MAWER.

LIVERPOOL.

Selections from Early Middle English, 1130–1250. Edited with Introductions and Notes by JOSEPH HALL. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1920. 8vo. 2 vols. vii + 675 pp. 21*s*.

Dr Joseph Hall's *Selections* make a most valuable addition to the very scanty apparatus hitherto available for the advanced teaching of Middle English. The selections are very largely the same as those given in the first portion of the *Specimens of Early English* of Richard Morris. But the field is worked over with that patient and thorough scholarship which we have come to expect from Dr Hall—that completeness, of which his edition of *King Horn* is so striking an example.

Further, Dr Hall has added a number of texts to those which Morris edited half a century ago. Students will be glad to have so careful an edition of the *Worcester Fragments* and *Saint Godric's Hymns*. Then comes the extract from the *Peterborough Chronicle*. This begins at a rather earlier point than in Morris—with the events of the year 1132. From this point to the end of the *Chronicle* the work of this last continuator forms an isolated passage differing in form and language from the rest of the *Chronicle*. It is one of the most precious fragments of English extant: for, written at Peterborough a little after 1155, it gives us information, fixed as to time and place, regarding one of the most important and most obscure periods of English. Of this priceless document Dr Hall has made a model edition, covering in all 25 pages, with a complete study of phonology, accidence, dialect and vocabulary. *The Charter of Henry II*, which has not hitherto been much utilized,

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

follows, and then the Parable from the Vespasian MS., with which Morris began his *Specimens*. The *Proverbs of Alfred* are printed complete, according to the version in the Jesus MS. The scope of Dr Hall's book does not allow him to give the other texts of the *Proverbs*, but it is noteworthy that the information he gives as to the sources from which the lost MS. (*Cotton Galba A xix*) can be reconstructed is, in fact, fuller than that given in the editions of Skeat or Borgström, which try to reconstruct that text.

In the case of the longer documents—the *Ancren Riwle*, Lazamon, Orm, *The Owl and the Nightingale*, *Genesis and Exodus*—there is room only for a comparatively short extract, and consequently the analyses of the language, though full, are of necessity not exhaustive. In the case of the *Poema Morale* space did not allow specimens of all the MSS. to be given. But no student of any of these texts can afford to overlook Dr Hall's commentaries. To give only one example: he notes that Mr G. C. Macaulay's arguments in favour of French as the original language of the *Ancren Riwle* are not convincing: this is worthy of attention, and has already been confirmed by further research.

The Bestiary is given complete, and we accordingly have a model edition of this most important document, for which hitherto there has been no easily available apparatus, for Mätzner has not been accessible to English students as a whole. It is interesting to note that Dr Hall seems to agree with Professor Wyld in placing this poem in Norfolk (for 'the northern part of East Anglia' can mean nothing else). Dr Hall, who generally seems inclined to define in some detail the different stages through which his texts have passed, sees in the poem traces of transmission through Lincolnshire and Essex. But it may be disputed how far it is possible in many of these texts to differentiate between the dialect of the original author and that of the scribe. Dr Hall's *Selections* appeared before Professor Wyld's discussion of 'South-Eastern and South-East Midland Dialects in Middle English[1].' Professor Wyld suggests that the combination of dialectal features found in the *Lambeth* and *Trinity* homilies is not to be attributed to scribes and copyists, but represents the genuine speech habits of a particular area, that area being London and its immediate neighbourhood. It is a pity that this study came out after the publication of Dr Hall's *Selections*, and that Dr Hall had no opportunity of weighing its findings against the older theory, maintained by him, which attributes the combination of dialectal features in these homilies to the modification of Southern texts by South-Midland scribes.

All students of Middle English must be grateful to this veteran worker for his laborious and exhaustive studies. Nothing published seems to have escaped him.

R. W. CHAMBERS.

LONDON.

[1] *Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association*, VI, Oxford, 1920.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

The Troubadours and England. By H. J. CHAYTOR. Cambridge: University Press. 1923. vi + 164 pp. 6*s*.

In studying the literature dealing with the Middle English lyric, one often comes across vague suggestions as to the influence exercised upon this branch of our national poetry by the Provençal troubadours, but no attempt has so far been made to settle the question. Mr Chaytor has now filled the gap, and come to the conclusion that the evidence he adduces is sufficient to entitle us to infer that the influence of troubadour poetry upon the Middle English lyric was considerable. He bases his conclusion mainly on the following grounds: (*a*) a comparison of Middle English and Provençal stanza-forms and rhyme-arrangements, (*b*) certain similarities of thought and expression, (*c*) the political and commercial relations of England and Southern France at the time, and (*d*) the fact that two troubadours are known to have visited England.

I am sorry to say that Mr Chaytor's arguments have left me quite unconvinced, and have not shaken in any way the belief I always held—that the poetry of the troubadours had exercised very little, if any, influence on the Middle English lyric. The Middle English lyric strophic forms display none of the intricacies so characteristic of its southern sister; the few coincidences in stanza-forms which Mr Chaytor quotes are quite simple combinations which would occur to any lyric poet, apart from the fact that the majority of his examples are taken not from the English but from the Anglo-Norman poets. The same remark applies to the trivial verbal resemblances which he brings forward; they are such as would belong to the common fund, and the few that may not belong to that category are much more likely to have come to England from French than from Provençal, as indeed the author himself suggests in more than one passage. The political and commercial relations existing between England and Southern France at the time were naturally considerable, but is it at all probable that the Angevins, or those about their court, took any lively interest in native British poetry, or that the traders (they might in some cases learn a few words of *commercial* Provençal) gave a thought to the love casuistry of the troubadours? There remains the fact that two troubadours did come to England—Bernard de Ventadorn and Savaric de Mauléon. Bernard made a short stay, probably in the autumn of the year 1155, at the court of Henry II, where, except for the climatic conditions, he would hardly realise that he was away from home. As for Savaric de Mauléon, he can hardly claim a place among the troubadours proper; the only poetry of his which has come down to us consists of one stanza and his share in a *tenso*. During his stay in England (1215–16) he conducted himself more like a Hun than a lover of the Muses, and appears to have been far too busy harrying the country as a ruthless supporter of John to have had time to do much else. In any case, it is not easy to see how Bernard's brief visit to Henry's court or Savaric's campaigning in John's cause can have had any effect, even indirectly, on the character of the Middle English lyric.

Digitized by Google Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Though, in my view, Mr Chaytor's scholarly investigation has not achieved a positive result, it was well worth the trouble, and all lovers of Provençal poetry will be grateful to him for having undertaken it. The evidence, such as it is, is ably marshalled, and it may well be that more than one reader will accept his verdict rather than mine.

L. E. KASTNER.

MANCHESTER.

Types of English Drama, 1660–1780. By DAVID HARRISON STEVENS. Ginn and Company: Boston. 8vo. 1923. viii + 920 pp. $3.80.

The keen and growing interest in English dramatic literature and the history of the English theatre, which of recent years is become a marked and pleasing feature not only in our own but also in French, German and American scholarship, has logically necessitated the issue of various collections of representative plays, those comedies and tragedies which enjoyed so long a lease of life on the boards during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and of which the revivals in the living theatre are, moreover, being received to-day with unbounded favour and applause. Some five and thirty years ago the popular Mermaid editions, for which we must never be ungrateful, proved an inestimable boon to many. But the series was very unequal. The critical introductions and brilliant appreciations of such men as Addington Symonds, Havelock Ellis, Arthur Symons, it were impossible to better, but there are other volumes whose faulty editorship falls very far below this high standard. In every case, however, the text was presented in its entirety, or, at least, it was not bowdlerized with intention. Yet it was modernized, that is to say, the original scene divisions and stage-directions were extensively rewritten or expunged wholesale to introduce later methods and design. At the present time, such alterations would, of course, not be permissible. Accordingly we are glad to note that in his Preface Mr Stevens says: 'All but two of the texts are from the first editions.' The two excepted plays are *Tom Thumb*, which is given from the octavo of 1731, and *The School for Scandal*. It may be remarked that *The Rehearsal* should undoubtedly have been printed from the third quarto 'with amendments and large additions by the author,' 1675, and not from the *editio princeps* of 1672. Mr Stevens writes: '*The Rehearsal* was first printed in 1672 by Thomas Dring...the next (edition) in importance is dated 1675.' It is obvious from this aside that Mr Stevens has not examined the texts of *The Rehearsal* with sufficient attention. If he had consulted my edition of Buckingham's play he would have found fully set forth the reasons why preference must be given to the third quarto, 1675.

Mr Stevens tells us in his Preface that 'all additions to the text have been bracketed as they occur.' This is a useful and perfectly legitimate practice, but what is not legitimate is to rewrite a dramatist's stage-directions and to alter his phrasing apparently for no reason at all. This Mr Stevens has done so extensively and so superfluously that exact

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

scholars will be unable to accept his texts as being 'from the first editions.' Evidently the editor has failed to realize that the first quartos, when employed, must be followed most meticulously, in every detail, and only obvious misprints may be corrected. Even so, such amendments should be marked in a textual note. Congreve's *Love for Love* opens thus: 'Valentine *in his Chamber reading.* Jeremy *waiting.*' Mr Stevens has introduced an unnecessary '(Valentine's *lodging*).' 'Father to *Valentine* and *Ben*,' 'Second Wife to *Foresight*,' become respectively 'father (of) Valentine and Ben,' 'second wife of Foresight.' 'Several Servants' becomes 'Servants.' At the beginning of Act III when the brief conversation between Tattle and Miss Prue abruptly concludes we have the stage-directions: '(*Thrusts her in, and shuts the Door.*) *Enter* Valentine, Scandal, *and* Angelica.' It will be seen that Tattle remains on the stage and the action continues without interruption. Mr Stevens after 'shuts the Door' interpolates '(Scene 2. *A room in* Foresight's *house*)': he then writes '(*Enter*) Valentine, Scandal, *and* Angelica,' and twenty lines further down he has '(*Enter* Tattle *at a distance*).' These variations are not trifling; they are entirely destructive of Congreve's theatrical technique, and in actual production they lead to endless difficulty and confusion. In Act IV we have a very bad misconjecture. The scene, Valentine's *Lodging* (4to 1), is the same throughout. Mr Stevens, at the end of Valentine's speech, 'If Prophecy comes, Truth must give Place,' for no understandable reason inserts '*Exeunt*,' and 'Scene 2. *An ante-room at* Valentine's *lodgings.*' These new stage-directions, for which there is no authority whatsoever and which are in the highest degree detrimental to the whole business of the act, are left without brackets, and so according to the Preface should be found in the original text. It is certain that Mr Stevens does not appreciate how mischievous is all this tinkering at an author's stage-directions.

Again, in the Preface, Mr Stevens tells us: 'The needless, and often misleading, use of italic type has been eliminated, the punctuation and spelling have been modernized.' This gives us pause, and certainly strikes a very unscholarly note. The seventeenth-century use of italics by such writers as Dryden and Congreve, so far from being needless, is meticulously systematized; and in any reprint which pretends to exactness it should be most carefully preserved. Further, it is impossible to understand how such usage can be considered in any way misleading. Indeed if Mr Stevens had kept the original italics he would have saved himself at least one very bad blunder. In *The Way of the World*, Act III, Sir Wilfull, the Shropshire Knight, says reproachfully to Witwoud: 'You cou'd intreat to be remember'd then to your Friends round the *Rekin.*' Mr Stevens, who prints 'round the reckan' (p. 354), explains 'reckan' as 'Hooks to hang pots over a fire'! The modernization of punctuation and spelling is frankly deplorable. Such changes as 'Egypt' for 'Ægypt' (*All for Love*); 'subtle nets' for 'subtile nets' (*All for Love*); 'dashed the saucy waves' for 'dasht the sawcy waves' (*Venice Preserv'd*); 'Sir Charles Bountiful' for 'Sir Charles Bountyful' (*The Beaux Stratagem*);

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

'prune sauce' for 'pruin sauce' (*She Stoops to Conquer*)—are real blemishes. Editorial experience soon demonstrates that by accommodating authors to modern norms and fashions something even more valuable than old-time flavour and atmosphere is irretrievably lost.

It would appear, moreover, that for all the editor's emphatic assertions in many instances the first editions have not been consulted. There is strong evidence that in *Love for Love* a late reprint has been followed. In Trapland's speech (p. 283) we have: 'when I have drunk it.' This is the reading of 1710. 4to 1 has: 'when I have drank it.' In Sir Sampson's speech (p. 292) we have: 'He has a damned Tyburn-face.' 4to 1 gives: 'a has a damn'd *Tyburn*-face.' 1710, following 4to 4, reads: 'He has a damn'd *Tyburn*-face.' In Mrs Frail's speech (p. 294) we have: 'I'll swear you have a great deal of confidence.' This is the alteration of 1710. 4to 1 has: 'I'll swear you have a great deal of Impudence.' Sir Sampson's last speech (p. 327) according to Mr Stevens runs: 'You're an illiterate old fool, and I'm another. *Exit.*' According to the first quarto this speech is: 'You're an illiterate Fool, and I'm another, and the Stars are Lyars; and if I had Breath enough, I'd curse them and you, my self and every Body—Oons, Cully'd, Bubbl'd, Jilted, Woman-bobb'd at last, I have not Patience. *Exit Sir Samp.*' These are but a few examples from many in one play, and they are by no means the most remarkable. Although *Love for Love* has been taken as an instance, there are few plays in this volume which similar blemishes do not mar. In *The Way of the World*, Act II, Mincing speaks of 'a Pecquet of Letters' and vows she has had 'the Cremp' in her fingers. These are the readings of the first quarto, 1700, and, of course, denote an affected pronunciation. 1710 prints 'Pacquet' and 'Cramp.' Mr Stevens has 'a packet of letters' and 'cramp.' Again, in Act III of the same comedy towards the end of the scene between Foible and Mrs Fainall, the first quarto reads: '*Enter Footman.* (*Foible*) *John*—remove my Lady's Toilet.' Instead of *Enter Footman* 1710 substitutes the stage-direction '(*Calls*).' This is reproduced in Mr Stevens' text, p. 349. In Act IV Witwoud speaks of 'an unfix'd Camlet.' This is the reading of the first quarto. Later editions have 'an unsiz'd Camlet,' and Mr Stevens prefers 'an unsized camlet.' In Act V Foible has the following sentence: 'But it was but a Book of Verses and Poems.' 1710 and the later editions read: 'But it was but a Book of Poems,' and Mr Stevens also omits the two words, which, after the first quarto, had been accidentally slipped. In the same act Mrs Marwood refers to 'Voices more licentious than the loud *Flounderman's*, or the Woman that crys Grey-pease.' All editions save the first end this sentence at 'Flounderman's,' as also does Mr Stevens. From these and many other instances which could be given it seems obvious that Mr Stevens did not consult the first quarto of *The Way of the World*.

The choice of plays for such a collection as the present may be regarded from more than one point of view. And yet I would suggest that in any case it is superfluous to give four of Sheridan's comedies and *She Stoops to Conquer*, all of which are so readily accessible. Lillo's *The London Merchant*, again, excellently edited by Sir Adolphus Ward, is in

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

the Belles-Lettres Series, which also provides *All for Love*, *Venice Preserv'd*, *The Beaux Stratagem*, and *Jane Shore*. In place of these *Tyrannick Love*, *The Fatal Marriage*, *Oroonoko*, and one of Cibber's early comedies would have been welcome in Mr Stevens' volume, which further should most certainly have included at least one of Mrs Centlivre's lively plays, together with Murphy's *The Way to Keep Him* or *All in the Wrong*; Foote's *The Minor*; *The Suspicious Husband*; and Colman's admirable *The Jealous Wife*. Shadwell's *Bury Fair* is to be found in the Mermaid *Shadwell*, and it would have been just as easy to have given here *The Virtuoso* or *Epsom Wells*. When, however, I read in the Preface that 'Wycherley...(has) not sufficient historical importance to justify the reprinting of plays quite out of keeping with modern taste' I feel that it would have been far better to confine the selection strictly to the eighteenth century. I had hoped that the brilliant and exhaustive study of that distinguished French scholar M. Charles Perromat, *William Wycherley, Sa vie, son œuvre* (1921), would have made this kind of finicking for the future impossible.

By omitting to print the original casts, when given in the first quartos, opposite the lists of Dramatis Personae Mr Stevens has, I think, made a mistake. It is true that in some instances he supplies the actors' names in his Notes at the end of the volume, but this is an awkward arrangement and apt to be confusing. Incidentally it may be remarked that in the cast of *Bury Fair* (p. 886) Mr Stevens records a Mr Butler. There was at that time no actor of this name. The reference is, of course, to the celebrated Charlotte Butler, who played Philadelphia, disguised until the *dénouement* of the fifth act as Charles, Lord Bellamy's page. In the cast of *The London Merchant* Mr Stevens gives: 'Mesdames Cibber, Butler, and Clark.' Clark should be Mrs Charke, who acted Lucy. Charlotte Charke was Colley Cibber's youngest daughter, and a notable figure in her day. The collected *Works of Mr George Lillo* (T. Davies), 2 vols. 8vo. 1775, and the second edition, 1810, both misprint Clarke, but the first edition of *The London Merchant*, 8vo. 1731, gives Mrs Charke.

Mr Stevens has chosen to print his Notes in a double and not very satisfactory fashion. The explanations of single words or short phrases are given at the foot of the page; more detailed matter is relegated to the end of the book. It is always a somewhat difficult task for an editor to decide which expressions call for annotation and which may be safely left to his readers' knowledge or intelligence. It is certainly better to give too much rather than too little. But Mr Stevens might surely have with reason expected 'the literary student,' for whom this collection is designed, to have known that *belles assemblées* means 'fair assemblies' (p. 50); *bel air*, fine style (p. 51); *bien ganté*, well gloved (p. 51); *éclaircissement*, explanation (p. 55); *coup d'essai*, experimental piece (p. 67); all of which foot-notes are supplied to one play, *The Man of Mode*. Mr Stevens has further deemed it necessary to explain that 'to bait' means 'to annoy' (p. 182); that 'weeds' are 'garments' (p. 183); '*memento mori*' is 'remember to die' (p. 188); 'hearse,' a bier (p. 189);

Digitized by Google Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

canaille, rabble (p. 240); *recherchée*, choice (p. 241); *Je vous assure*, I assure you (p. 255); *Je vous remercie*, I thank you (p. 257); *beau monde*, world of fashion (p. 343); *Allons*, Let's go (p. 693). To balance these superfluities, however, many phrases which obviously require elucidation are passed over without comment. A note upon such passages as the following were certainly needful: 'that she may look sparkishly in the forefront of the King's box at an old play' (*The Man of Mode*, p. 32); 'The periwig? Chedreux' (*The Man of Mode*, p. 51); 'Spanish pilgrims cast a-shore in Wales' (Prologue to *Venice Preserv'd*, p. 181); 'a witch's prayer, and dreams and Dutch almanacs are to be understood by contraries' (*Love for Love*, p. 318); 'And make a livelihood of Pinkey's face' (Prologue to *The Conscious Lovers*, p. 484); 'he is among the anatomies at Surgeon's Hall' (*The Beggar's Opera*, p. 535); 'I carried a silver-flowered lutestring and a piece of black padesoy to Mr Peachum's lock but last week' (*The Beggar's Opera*, p. 539); 'one of these fine, old, dressy things...in the public gardens looking for all the world like one of the painted ruins of the place' (*The Good Natur'd Man*, p. 659); 'the very genteelest of tunes, Water Parted, or the minuet in Ariadne' (*She Stoops to Conquer*, p. 694); 'I take care to know every *tête-à-tête* from the Scandalous Magazine' (*She Stoops to Conquer*, p. 703); 'The great one is only *The Whole Duty of Man* where I press a few blonds' (*The Rivals*, p. 731). All these and very many more allusions in every play are left without a word of explanation.

On the other hand, we have a large number of notes which are quite unsatisfactory, and an even larger number which are patently erroneous. Thus the description of William Wintershall as 'an old actor who had appeared in many minor rôles' (p. 878) is extremely misleading, as Wintershall was a performer of much merit and distinction, who had played with great applause such parts as Sir Amorous La Foole in *The Silent Woman*, Subtle in *The Alchemist*, King Henry in *1 Henry IV*. Downes says he was excellent both in tragedy and in comedy, 'especially in Cokes, in *Bartholomew Fair*, that the famous comedian, Nokes, came, in that part, far short of him'; Pepys (28 April, 1668) was delighted with his Sir Gervase Simple in Shirley's *Love in a Maze*; and John Dennis ungrudgingly extols his Slender. In *The Man of Mode*, Act III, Lady Woodvill remarks: ''Tis good breeding now to be civil to none but players and Exchange women.' Upon this Mr Stevens writes (p. 880): 'Exchange women. Such as frequented the "Old" or Royal Exchange.' The intended inference is wholly beside the point. 'Exchange women' here merely means the milliners and sempstresses who kept shops and stalls in the Exchange, such as Mrs Furnish 'an Exchange-Woman' in Otway's *The Atheist*. In *The Way of the World*, Act III, Fainall says: 'My Wife had added Lustre to my Horns by that Encrease of Fortune; I cou'd have worn 'em Tipt with Gold,' and Mrs Marwood replies: 'They may prove a Cap of Maintenance to you still.' Mr Stevens' note (p. 890) is: 'a cap of maintenance: a sign of office, to be carried in procession before one in authority.' This is not merely inaccurate but it misses the whole point of the rejoinder, which lies in the fact that a cap of main-

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

tenance is furnished behind with two corniculate projections. In a note (p. 887) upon *Love for Love* Mr Stevens informs us that 'The source of the main story was Molière's *L'Avare*, which Congreve used in a clear, well-motivated action surpassing his other plays in point of structure.' This sentence, I confess, baffles me completely. I am unable to find the smallest trace of *L'Avare* in *Love for Love*, and I am left wondering what Mr Stevens can mean.

Among the notes at the end of the volume we have (p. 880): 'Bethlem (or Bethlehem): a hospital for the insane, in Bishopsgate,' where, of course, it is not situated. Ombre is described (p. 880) as: 'a card game for three persons, played without the eights, nines, and tens.' At ombre the eights, nines, and tens are not discarded but remain in the pack. A note (p. 882) upon Dryden's Epistle Dedicatory to *Aureng-Zebe* runs: 'Mandana: mother of Cyrus by Cambyses.' The context makes it perfectly plain that the reference is to an incident in Madeleine de Scudéry's romance *Le Grand Cyrus*. 'Yet this *Mandana* (and the *Cyrus* was written by a Lady) was not altogether so hard-hearted' are Dryden's words. In *Le Grand Cyrus*, 'l'incomparable Mandane,' daughter of Cyaxares, King of Cappadocia, is the heroine beloved by Cyrus, and under these names all the world recognized Mme de Longueville and Condé. In *Bury Fair*, Act III, Mrs Fantast foolishly sighs out: 'Monsieur Scudéry says very well, "L'amour est une grande chose".' Mr Stevens gives us a note upon Madeleine de Scudéry. Yet the noble, if gasconading, figure of Georges de Scudéry is not insignificant in French literature. His poem *Alaric*; his tragedies, *Ibrahim* and the rest; his comedies, notably *La comédie des Comédiens*, are all sufficiently well known. Scandal (*Love for Love*, Act III) when bantering old Foresight declares: '*Solomon* was Wise, but how?—by his Judgment in Astrology—So says *Pineda*, in his Third Book and Eight Chapter.' Mr Stevens upon this ventures the following egregious remark (p. 888): 'Pineda. Scandal chooses his authorities at random. Juan de Pineda was a Spanish theologian.' So far from the authorities being chosen at random the exact passages to which Scandal refers may be cited in each instance. Mr Stevens has either not troubled himself, or he has been unable, to find the passages in Gregory the Great and Albertus Magnus, which should, of course, have been verified. The passage from Pineda occurs in what is perhaps the best known work of that famous Jesuit scholar, *De Rebus Salomonis Regis*, Liber III, c. xviii, whose rubric runs: 'Idem (Salomon) summus Astronomus.' It may be noticed that Congreve has made a slight slip and written Eight for Eighteen. In *The Beaux Stratagem* upon the allusion Toftida we have the following note (p. 891): 'Toftida: Katherine Tofts. She had sung the songs in *The Recruiting Officer*.' The only song proper in *The Recruiting Officer*, 'Come, fair one, be kind,' is sung by Plume (Wilks), who also has two short catches, 'Over the hills' and 'But it is not so.' There is a catch trolled by Kite (Estcourt), 'Our prentice Tom may now refuse,' with a chorus in which Pear-main and Apple-Tree join.

In a very injudicious 'Epistle Dedicatory' couched in Wardour-Street

Digitized by Google Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

English of the worst possible taste which announced *Types of English Drama* we are told: 'The scholarly work of our editor may be judged, too, by the Foot Notes, wherein sundry recondite and outmoded words are made plain.' Amongst the foot-notes plentifully occur such absurdities as the following: *sapiens dominabitur astris*, 'The wise man will be ruled by the stars' (p. 291). This is a schoolboy's grammatical blunder. The whole point of *sapiens dominabitur astris* when quoted by Sir Sampson (*Love for Love*, Act II) is that the wise man is master of his stars. *Love for Love*, Act III, Tattle says: 'You know where we raffled.' In *Bury Fair*, Act II, the fair scene, Sir Humphrey urges the company: 'Come, gentlemen and ladies; come down guineas apiece, and raffle for a teapot,' and earlier in the scene the Goldsmith bawls out: 'Will you please to raffle for a Teapot, a pair of candlesticks, a couple of sconces?' Tattle's remark is plain enough, yet Mr Stevens writes upon 'raffled' 'Old form of "rifle," to plunder' (p. 299). In *Love for Love*, Act IV, Valentine, when Foresight and gay young Mrs Foresight come to visit him, in his pretended frenzy cries out to the old fellow: 'Ha! ha! ha! That a Man should have a Stomach to a Wedding Supper, when the Pidgeons ought rather to be laid to his Feet, ha, ha, ha.' Mr Stevens notes on Pidgeons, 'stocks (?)' (p. 315). It seems necessary to explain that the allusion here is to the barbaric practice of cutting a live pigeon in half and clapping it to the soles of the feet of those *in extremis*. This remedy is fully described in *The English Huswife* (1615) and elsewhere. In *The Duchess of Malfi*, II, 1, Bosola says to the Old Lady: 'I would sooner eate a dead pidgeon, taken from the soles of the feete of one sicke of the plague, than kisse one of you fasting.' In *The Way of the World*, Act III, when the rustic Sir Wilfull enters, Witwoud whispers to Petulant: 'Smoke the Boots, the Boots; *Petulant*, the Boots.' Mr Stevens explains 'Smoke' as 'take a look at' (p. 353). *The Dictionary of the Canting Crew* (*circa* 1700) has: '*Smoke him, smoke him again*, to affront a Stranger at his coming in.' Mr Stevens did not understand the slang term and invented a meaning. Act III, *The Beaux Stratagem*, Aimwell in a rapture exclaims: 'Call me Oroondates, Cesario, Amadis, all that romance can in a lover paint!' Mr Stevens comments upon Cesario: 'In *Twelfth Night* Viola's assumed name' (p. 389). True, but entirely impertinent. As Oroondates is the hero of La Calprenède's *Cassandre*, so Cesario is a typical lover in the same author's *Cléopâtre*. Hardcastle in *She Stoops to Conquer* proposes to give Marlow at supper a florentine. Mr Stevens abruptly tells us that a florentine is 'A pastry' (p. 700) which at best does not mean very much. According to an eighteenth-century cookery-book a florentine is a 'made Dish of Minced Meats, Currans, Spice, Eggs, etc., Bak'd.' The above are fair, and only a few, specimens of the numberless errors and inaccuracies with which the foot-notes abound.

To recommend a book which is disfigured, and radically disfigured, by such grave blemishes is impossible. The work of an editor is both difficult and laborious, and those who are most exercised in editorship will always be the first to overlook the slips and slight mistakes which, however regrettably, are almost inevitably bound to intrude upon even

Digitized by Google

Original from
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

the most conscientiously collated texts and most carefully considered annotation. Of the twenty-two plays included in *Types of English Drama 1660–1780* there are perhaps two which have not before been edited, though all have been frequently reprinted. In spite of his profuse acknowledgement of indebtedness 'to many friends and many books,' the librarians of Harvard University and the Library of Congress, the extensive collections of the late Mr John H. Wrenn, bibliographical notes by Mr T. J. Wise, Mr Stevens gives us nothing new, nothing original. Difficulties are commonly passed over without comment or attempt at elucidation. Not merely has there been no research, but Mr Stevens cannot even make use of such well-known material, as the standard editions of the plays he has included, Strunk's *All for Love*, McClumpha's *Venice Preserv'd*, Strauss' *The Beaux Stratagem*, Sir Adolphus Ward's *The London Merchant*, and the rest. The most glaring faults of all, perhaps, are the endless inaccuracies and worse than inaccuracies which, if not due to sheer carelessness, unmistakably demonstrate that Mr Stevens is insufficiently equipped for the literary work of editorship. In any case the egregious contention of the preliminary announcement, described as an *Epistle Dedicatory* and *Prologue*, which asserts that 'The reader may find some faults with the *Epistle Dedicatory* and with the *Prologue*, but we can give him honest assurance that he will find none with the Work for which they were composed, namely, *Types of English Drama*, 1660–1780,' cannot be for a moment maintained.

MONTAGUE SUMMERS.

LONDON.

The Art of Poetry. Seven Lectures 1920–22. By WILLIAM PATON KER. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1923. 8vo. 160 pp. 6*s*. net.

If the reader turns to this book in the hope of finding either an academic inquiry into the theory of poetry, or even a touchstone by which to correct and form his own taste, he will be disappointed. The secret of poetry is a secret still. The late Professor Ker would be the last to question such a conclusion. He admits that the art, unlike painting or sculpture, speaks no universal language, but is obscured and complicated by difficulties of vocabulary, expression, sentiment and pronunciation. Its pure genius has to be tracked and delved for. But the lecturer can give the searcher some help. He has found that the true vitalising spirit seems, in some inexplicable way, to be bound up with certain metres and to be warmed into life by 'this mysterious power of certain formulas, abstract relations of syllables....Abstract harmony takes possession of the minds of poets, and compels their thought and imagination to move in the same measure.'

Thus the fire and spirit of poetry, in themselves indescribable, are interpenetrated by the influences of form and tradition, which can easily be understood. Such seems to be the idea underlying this course of lectures, and, as an explanation, it does not carry the student very far. Professor Ker recognises that form and spirit are two very different

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

things, and that their association is too elusive and variable to be subjected to scientific legislation. Poetic genius can burst into full possession of its power without long preparation or experiment, as in the case of Shakespeare and the Elizabethan drama, or it can descend upon some long-established form and unexpectedly etherealise what for centuries had been conventional and drab, as in the case of Burns. Yet form and spirit are none the less interdependent. Shelley is presented to us as an intensely poetic spirit, impelled by his own instinct to peer and wander through the chambers of the human mind, but unable to capture his own inspiration till the requisite form and frame had been found; notably in *Prometheus Unbound*. How did Milton come to compose *Samson Agonistes*? Was it merely to enrich his nation's literature with a type of Atticised drama, as he had already enriched it with two types of classical epic? Rather because he had something within him, which neither *Paradise Lost* nor *Paradise Regained* gave him an opportunity of expressing. He was driven by the strength of his own genius to portray a soul winning to victory against apparently unconquerable enemies, by a succession of conquests over himself. It needed the Greek tragic idea to give scope to this impulse.

And yet, if we are ever really to enjoy and appreciate poetry, we must remember that the touch of individuality strikes deeper than any 'influence' or doctrine or traditional form. Professors, who forget this fact, talk too much about movements. Take, for instance, the Romantic Movement. On the one hand it existed, and here and there makes itself recognisable, all through the Eighteenth Century. On the other hand, what is really excellent in Shelley, Keats and Wordsworth is independent of its atmosphere and cult. Critics are equally ready to characterise Pope as a satirist. Yet he will not properly be understood and appreciated, if the reader allows himself to be so far impressed by the subject and form as to look for nothing else. The epic spirit (according to Professor Ker) peeps out in nearly all the best passages, besides impelling this critic of modern society to translate Homer. Or take Matthew Arnold. His best poetry has an unmistakeable kinship with the Greeks. Yet where does this classical strain find its most unfettered expression? Not in *Merope*, but in *Sohrab and Rustum*, because the Tartar story, though so wild and romantic, somehow quickens and stimulates his hellenism.

Thus there is nothing very original in *The Art of Poetry*, and presumably for that reason the reprint has been treated rather condescendingly by reviewers. But an hour's lecture (especially if delivered in Professor Ker's leisurely and deliberate manner) is not adapted to develop any profound or debateable doctrine. Its function is to stimulate and suggest. From this point of view, the series of lectures is admirable. The pages are remarkable for profuse quotations and vast and recondite learning, yet every paragraph breathes a horror of pedantry. Perhaps this combination of erudition and humanism constitutes the real originality of the book.

H. V. Routh.

London.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

The Problem of Style. By J. MIDDLETON MURRY. London : Humphrey Milford. 1922. 8vo. vii + 148 pp. 6*s.* 6*d.*

The main idea is simple enough. The problem of style is to write in such a way that the author's mood may awaken a kindred mood in the reader; in other words, he must first realise intensely his own idea, and then he must select the arts and artifices of literature, which make this state of mind not only lucidly intelligible to himself, but to the reader who has not previously gone through his mental travail. In Mr Murry's own words, the problem of style is 'to compel language to conform to the writer's mode of experience'; 'to make each word relevant to the originating emotion'; 'to give to the particular the weight of the universal.'

These generalisations are not new. They would in themselves help neither the aspiring author nor the aspiring critic. All depends on the deductions and amplifications of the theory. To what ideas is the reader led after initiation into this doctrine? For one thing the initiate is reminded how rarely pure literature deals with pure thought, but rather with perceptions, intuitions, and emotional convictions to which the reader must be attuned. Ideas are only a framework or background to these states of mind. 'The thought that plays a part in literature is systematised emotion, emotion become habitual till it attains the dignity of conviction.' Then he will learn that, if the judicial, criticising mood predominates, prose is the most effective means of expression, but that, when personal emotion is overwhelming, the artist resorts to poetry. Such ought to be the main difference between these two forms of speech, and (we are told) a writer is heavily handicapped when the fashion of his age prevents him from using that one of the two modes which suits him best. Thus Massinger suffered when he wrote tragedies, and Browning because he did not write novels. Whatever the mood and the mode of expression, the central problem is to find some 'symbol' which will 'evoke in the reader an emotional reaction as nearly as possible identical with the emotion which the writer is feeling.' By 'symbol' Mr Murry means any device which is not merely descriptive, and he concludes (contrary to the views of many) that the most effective means are neither rhythm nor imagery, but 'precision of emotional suggestion,' that is to say metaphors, illustrations, examples, impressions, so enforced that, themselves concrete, they flash into the reader's mind a vaguer, more abstract world of sensuous and spiritual experiences.

All this is sheer hard thinking. The average reader will probably recognise the soundness of the arguments, and will confess that he had never thought it all out for himself. But some will feel inclined to add that they never needed to think it out and will ask whether this analysis leaves any one the wiser, though it may leave many temporarily more interested. If there is an answer to that question, it must be looked for in the fifth lecture, 'The Process of Creative Style.' In this section Mr Murry applies his theories—his *discoveries*—to the actual appreciation of beautiful passages. He shows the reader what to look for

Digitized by Google Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

and what to enjoy in a number of representative and typical selections, chosen with admirable judgment from a vast store of reading. These excerpts are particularly valuable because they are not all used as examples of perfection; some of the most welcome are exhibited to illustrate the lack of artistic skill.

Thus the book is valuable as an exercise in artistic perception. It shows the reader how to enjoy workmanship; how to feel the thrill of seeing someone else hit the mark. Being thus somewhat different in purpose from the average academic teaching, the book is all the more welcome because addressed to University students. Possibly more than one undergraduate feels a new direction given to his studies from the day when he listened to this lecturer or afterwards read his printed word. But however grateful for the impulse, the average reader will find that *The Problem of Style* does not carry him very far. He will be surprised to discover how little real help he derives from all this exposition and explanation, when he tries to apply Mr Murry's methods to any fine piece of composition not discussed in the book. Before exploring the resources of a great writer, the student has to acquire kinship with his spirit, and no book on style can teach him how to do that.

H. V. Routh.

London.

Principles of English Prosody. Part I. The Elements. By Lascelles Abercrombie. London: Martin Secker. 1923. 156 pp. 5*s.* net.

Mr Lascelles Abercrombie has written the most suggestive, and on the whole, I think, the soundest book on English Metric of the last two generations. He has the very great merit of having emphasized the two essential factors of verse, what he calls the 'base' and the 'modulation.' In a work published in 1905, *L'Alexandrin et le Blank Verse*, I laid down the law that the 'metrical scheme' (which I then called the 'metre') and the phonetic constitution of the portion of speech-material adjusted to it (which I then called the 'rhythm') are both inviolable, and that the problem at issue is the exact adjustment or 'adaptation' of the latter to the former. No modern English writer (I include myself, although I wrote in French) had up till then emphasized this essential point. I claim no originality: my ideas were derived with but slight modification from the greatest European metrist of modern times, Professor F. Wulff, of Lund, and from his somewhat dissident pupil, Professor F. Saran, of Halle. In other respects I have altered my views very considerably since then, and have expressed them in their new form in critical reviews in this journal and in letters to the *Times Literary Supplement*. But I have never ceased to hold, and have never ceased to lay down with the utmost emphasis to my classes in the University of Dublin, that the science of metric deals with the inviolable 'metrical scheme' or 'metrical constitution' (what Mr Lascelles Abercrombie calls the 'base'), and with the adjustment to it of a portion of

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

speech-material (with its phonetic form, as imposed by considerations of historical development, logical and emotional content, etc., also inviolable). The problem is just how much incongruence (or non-coincidence) the ear will tolerate in the case of any given type of verse (i.e. verse modulated to a given base) without losing the rhythm of the base.

The isochronists, Mr T. S. Omond, Mr Egerton-Smith, or, in a more elaborate way, Mr W. Thomson, M. Paul Verrier, M. Landry, and the centroidists fail, in spite of great learning and most suggestive treatment, in not clearly distinguishing the phonetic matter adjusted to the base from the base itself. And that fundamental oversight vitiates their whole superstructure, although portions of their work, and a good deal of detail, retain their value.

Mr Lascelles Abercrombie is exceptionally clear and sound in distinguishing (p. 41):

(i) Rhythmic *Constancy*: the pattern persisting schematically through all variations and always heard in some recognizably equivalent form.

(ii) Rhythmic *Variation*: the expressive speech-rhythm always changing over the pattern and capable of accommodating itself to the frame of the pattern without ceasing to be natural utterance.

He warns us against the error of the phoneticians:

Beware of taking even the most elaborate account of sounds actually heard as an account of metre. There is no metre unless the sounds as they are actually heard are also referred to the constant scheme of an ideal pattern (p. 43).

He defines metre as 'the modulated repetition of a rhythmical pattern' (p. 55) and finds that 'all verse must equally give Rhythmic Constancy persisting through Rhythmic Variation' (p. 55), with the corollaries that (p. 56)

(i) Verse must not give a repeating pattern without any variation.
(ii) The variation must not destroy the repeating pattern.

The base of the heroic line or blank-verse line is

$$- \acute{-} \mid - \acute{-} \mid - \acute{-} \mid - \acute{-} \mid - \acute{-} \mid$$

(where – represents *any* syllable), but (p. 86) 'the base is an ideal rhythm and is only ideally heard.'

When we say the line (p. 101)

Burnt after them to the bottomless pit

is a blank-verse line—that is, a rhythm in its context capable as a whole of occupying the equivalent room of a five-foot disyllabic rising base—we have only to scan it thus

Búrnt áf | ter them | to the | bóttom | less pít

in order to see just how this comes about; for every element in the base is now clearly seen to be represented in the verse.

But (p. 104)

feet...belong wholly to scansion; they are a formality used in the investigation of metre, and have nothing to do with its composition or with its real nature. Scansion by foot-division pretends to do no more than to show, by enabling us to compare any line, syllable by syllable, with the components of the base, precisely how and precisely where it modulates.

Mr Lascelles Abercrombie protests against bad or incorrect scansion, which falls under three heads (pp. 107–9):

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

(i) It analyses metre with regard to the speech-rhythm as such. This is really a failure to achieve scansion at all; for metre is not in the qualities or dispositions of mere speech-rhythm, but in the way they exhibit conformity to an accepted constancy of pattern-rhythm....

(ii) It refers the speech-rhythm incorrectly to the base, or refers it to the wrong base...[1].

It is a pity, after this, that Mr Lascelles Abercrombie falls into the heresy of unnecessary (and unintended) trisyllabic and monosyllabic feet:

Nót to knit | mý soul | to an ap | próved | wánton...
Thrónes, | domináá | tions, princedoms, virtues, powers...
Of mán's | fírst | disobéd | ience and | the frúit...
Lóok where he | góes even | nów, | oút at the | pórtal...

[(p. 143) 'in which every element of the base is represented in the verse' (!)]

Amóngst | the enthrón'd | góds | on saín | ted seáts

[although he admits that the third foot 'contains not only "gods," but also an extension of "-thron'd"' (p. 152). Why not scan | 'th' enthrón | ed góds' | and be done with it?][2]

(iii) By far the commonest error of scansion is the distortion of speech-rhythm, or the untruthful marking of it, in order to display the base. This not only ruins the metre in every particular case, but violates the essential nature of metre; for the rhythmic variety of spoken words is as essential to metre as conformity to the constant pattern...[3].

Such scansions seem to me to be a confusion, unexpected in Mr Lascelles Abercrombie, of the phonetic division of the speech-material concerned with the metrical division of the verse.

Mr Lascelles Abercrombie notes (p. 123) the ease with which natural (i.e. phonetic) accents are reduced or slurred 'in the interests of metrical definition,' i.e. how readily an accented syllable may occupy a 'weak place' (as I prefer to say). I shall look forward to his explanation of the probable origin of this phenomenon in Part II, § 21 (11 *c*), not yet published. It is undoubtedly a fact.

[1] An interesting example is given from Drayton:

With breath and fingers giving life
To the shrill cornet and the fife,
Teaching each stop and key
To those upon the pipe that play.

The third line, taken alone, might be referred to a base:

– ⏑ | – ⏑ | – ⏑ |

but it should, like the others, be referred to the base:

– ⏑ | – ⏑ | – ⏑ | – ⏑ |

as:

Teách | ing eách | stóp | and kéy.

[2] I am by no means satisfied that the scansion of Campion's 'Harke al you ladies that do sleep' (p. 112) is correct.

[3] Mr Lascelles Abercrombie instances as vicious scansions:

Or do him mightier service ás his thralls...
Of Thamuz yearly wounded: thé love-tale

and yet does not attempt to introduce monosyllabic and trisyllabic feet into (p. 128):

Thy age like ours, O soul of Sír John Cheek

or:

Than all the cómplete armour that thou wearest...
She that hath that is clad in cómplete steel.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

The isochronists get short shrift from Mr Lascelles Abercrombie.

Nothing need be demanded of the sense of time in accentual rhythms but perception of the *order* in which accents and non-accents occur (p. 132). The whole notion of a fixt duration...is not only not required in order to understand accentual metre, but is alien to its nature (p 137)[1].

I must quarrel with Mr Lascelles Abercrombie over his refusal to make 'the distinction sometimes made between "syllabic" verse and accentual verse; the first supposed to be based on counting syllables, the second on counting accents' (p. 147). He illustrates his case, in a very futile manner, from the blank verse of *Paradise Lost* and that of the *Winter's Tale*. But nobody out of Bedlam supposes the latter to be non-syllabic. It is syllabic with a tendency towards reminiscence of the old-English accentual principle. Non-syllabic verse is verse like that of the old-English long line, that of Langland, of the nursery rhymes, of the ballads, etc. And I maintain that this is verse of a fundamentally different character from syllabic verse like Milton's or Shakespeare's blank-verse or the heroic line generally.

And that is where Mr Lascelles Abercrombie is as unsatisfactory as Mr Egerton-Smith. I am glad that he has ended his book with the true statement that 'there is no real analogy between the foot in verse and the bar in music,' but, had he clearly made and thoroughgoingly carried out the excellent distinction he makes (p. 144) between 'verse of Undistributed Accent' and 'verse of Distributed Accent,' and relegated a good deal of his so-called accentual verse to the former, leaving the latter to include only syllabic verse or verse fundamentally syllabic, he might have been able to admit what I believe to be true that isochronism *does* play an important part in non-syllabic verse (or verse of undistributed accent).

T. B. Rudmose-Brown.

Dublin.

England. Von Wilhelm Dibelius. 2 vols. Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt. 1923. 8vo. xv + 422, 276 pp.

Dr Dibelius's book is primarily an attempt to explain England to Germany, and as such it is a contribution to the reconstruction of after-the-war Germany; but it is written with such scientific aim that it is also a valuable history and criticism of English institutions. He surveys England and the British Empire in departments, beginning with the relation of England to Scotland, Ireland, and Wales. He describes in

[1] 'Yet a metrical enunciation of

Búrnt áf | ter them | to the | bóttom | less pít

very likely does require the syllables in the unaccented feet to be slightly prolonged; not in the least in the hope of attaining to a certain duration as such—to a duration, namely, which will also accommodate

Rocks, caves, lakes, fens, bogs, dens; and shades of death—

but simply...to enforce reference to the base, to emphasize the qualitative perception of the rhythm as metre' (p. 141).

'When the verse-foot – – is substituted for the base-foot – ⏑, it is not because – – is equivalent to – ⏑ in time, but because the substitution of – – will give an equivalent quality of succession' (p. 141).

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

detail the history of the parliamentary and party systems, the nature of the Colonial Empire, the systems of central and local administration, commerce and industry, the development of trade-unionism, law and equity, religion and education. He writes, of course, from a German point of view, and some of his criticisms may require modification before they will be acceptable to Englishmen; but his statements are accurate and full, and his book may well be read with profit and pleasure by English students.

The Englishman, we are told, is still a Saxon peasant at heart in spite of the years between—materialist in outlook, fond of comfort and good living, sober, energetic, thrifty, and conservative; and the later admixture of Norse and Norman blood has merely increased his energy and adaptability, without altering his temperament. Dr Dibelius regards English life as an association of heads of families, each family dwelling in a house surrounded by a garden, ranging in size from pocket-handkerchief to park. What is an English suburb but a more populous village, an attempt at a more densely inhabited country-side? The English character is a reconciliation of individualism and racial loyalty. The normal, average Englishman abhors the man who is 'different,' be he degenerate, highbrow, or genius; but he admires and reveres the normal man with qualities in excess, especially qualities of leadership. No nation displays such love of 'character.' This interest in personality may be seen in the English reader's love of biography, whether historical or fictional, and in English pictorial art, the staple of which is portrait-painting and dramatic scene on canvas.

G. H. Cowling.

Leeds.

A History of French Literature. By Kathleen Butler. 2 vols. London: Methuen and Co. 8vo. xiii + 496 pp., viii + 395 pp. 21*s*.

Although Mr Lytton Strachey's brilliant sketch still stands alone as a work of art, Miss Butler has written what is, in all respects, the best scholarly history of French Literature in English. These two volumes constitute an admirably balanced and compact manual, particularly suitable for University students and others who wish to obtain a clear general view of the development of French Literature in all its branches without dwelling unduly on any detail or following up fascinating bye-paths. Rightly Miss Butler has laid 'stress on the influence of historical events, of social conditions and of the general movement of ideas,' as the publisher tells us on the jackets of the volumes. In this, as in many other respects, Miss Butler's manual is superior to those of Dowden and Professor Saintsbury. She has abstained from burdening her pages with the names of minor writers, and, if occasionally a specialist would like to see a reference to some writer not usually given his due, yet we must feel grateful to Miss Butler for her sound grasp and common sense which have kept her from the pitfalls which are apt to beset and betray those whose interest is more specialized than hers. It

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

is a relief, also, to find a manual which is not dull, which is well-written, and which does a great deal more than condense larger manuals in French. Indeed it is evident that Miss Butler's statements are made at first-hand, and are the fruit of a wide and careful reading of the authors and of the most important monographs written upon them in recent years. If I venture on a few criticisms of detail, for which Miss Butler is at liberty to reproach me as a quibbling specialist in out of the way erudition, it must not be taken as my intention or desire in any way to detract from the value of her book.

Volume I is devoted to the period up to 1789. The chapters on the Middle Ages are excellent in every respect. I fancy, however, that the slight but amusing little play of *Courtois d'Arras* and also *Le Garçon et l'Aveugle* might have been mentioned among the few examples of mediaeval comic drama (pp. 75–6). Guillaume de Machaut is treated too cavalierly. He was not a great poet, but he had some artistic merits, and he influenced Chaucer. The chapters on the Renaissance give a concise account of the influences on and achievements of the sixteenth century in France. But the Renaissance in Italy, though reinforced by such events as the discovery of America, certainly owed very little to them and was in no wise determined by them. No two artists could be more typical than Poliziano in poetry and Botticelli in painting, and both were at their zenith before 1492. It is incorrect to use the term 'French' of the language of the Troubadours (p. 96). Le Maire de Belges (p. 117) is not given his due. It is incorrect to refer to Petrarch as a Platonist (p. 124). He was a Christian mystic. The School of Lyons is rightly given its due as a poetic influence. I think, however, that while Pernette du Guillet (not *de*) and Louise Labé are appraised correctly if concisely, Scève is dismissed rather summarily and only one of his works, albeit the most important, mentioned. *Délie* forms the chief link between the Italian Quattrocentists and French poetry. But *La Saulsage* is simpler, not at all obscure, and a very charming specimen of the eclogue and the starting point of that *genre* in French. Guillaume des Autels, the best critic of his time, if not a very good poet, is not mentioned.

The treatment of the School of Ronsard is satisfactory, even if Miss Butler is not as enthusiastic as I could have wished. It is disconcerting to be told that Ronsard's *Hymnes* are a failure (p. 132). Most critics point to them as one of his principal achievements. I cannot accept the assertion (p. 133) that there is 'no ring of sincerity' in Ronsard's Sonnets to Cassandre Salviati. She was, paradoxical as it may sound to say so, the one real love of his life. The sonnet admitted by Miss Butler as an exception: 'je vous envoye un bouquet...,' dates from 1555 and was probably addressed to Marie Dupin. It is not usually supposed that Astrée was one of Ronsard's own mistresses.

The earlier part of the seventeenth century receives, I think, the least adequate treatment. Preciosity is scantily dealt with by Miss Butler, and the earlier preciosity is not distinguished from the later. The poets before Malherbe are virtually ignored. It is true that M. Émile

Digitized by Google Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Faguet in his latest work, professedly a poetic history of this period, ignores them too in very large measure. I am perhaps over-critical, but I would put in a plea for Pierre Motin at least, not only because with Berthelot and Laugier de Porchères he was a Marinist and a friend of Marino, but because he represents the achievement, such as it was, and it is not negligible, of the earlier preciosity in lyric poetry. The Pastoral Drama, too, is ignored except for a bare mention of Tasso and Guarini as influences on French Pastoral. Bonarelli and Luigi Groto are quite as important influences, and the French Pastoral Drama itself is interesting both for what it is and for its influence on Corneille's earlier comedies to which, I regret to say, Miss Butler gives very little attention. It is true that they are not in the line of Molière, though *Le Misanthrope* owes something to them, but they are, in and for themselves, a very notable achievement. I would venture to refer her to my edition of Corneille's *La Galerie du Palais*, and to my *Short History of French Literature* for a supplementary treatment of this difficult period. The part of Chapelain in the formation of the Classical spirit is barely touched on by Miss Butler, and Sarasin, who had his part and no small one, is not mentioned. Of the later poets, surely Brébeuf is important, and Malleville and Montreuil, perhaps, worthy of mention. None are mentioned. The discussion of the Unities is far too summary. Their development and significance are not considered, nor is there any treatment of the evolution of stagecraft from the mediaeval through the simultaneous to the unitary 'décor' of the Classical Period.

The Classical Period is excellently treated. I might complain that, *sub specie aeternitatis*, Boileau gets more than his due and Racine less, but the proportion is not unreasonable if we consider the importance Boileau had in his day, and the fact that the public preferred Thomas Corneille to Racine. It is a pity that Molière is not given credit for his 'Shakespearean' comedies, *La Princesse d'Élide* and *Les Amants magnifiques*.

Miss Butler excels in her account of the prose-writers. Pascal, in particular, is most admirably treated. The transition from the Classical Period to the eighteenth century is stressed, as it should be, and Miss Butler brings out the development most lucidly. I am glad that, for once, Saint-Évremond is worthily treated, and justice done to Saint-Simon. Dufresny is somewhat inadequately treated. Baron might have been omitted and more space given to the far more interesting cousin of the King. I cannot think that Regnard was a better comic writer than Dancourt, nor that 'he uses comic effects as a means of stimulating thought' (p. 340).

I have little but praise for the treatment of the eighteenth century. But the *Prince travesti* of Marivaux should not have been ignored. It is a serious omission that Gessner is nowhere mentioned among the influences on the 'precursors of Romanticism.' I am glad that Bertin is justly referred to, among the poets, as one in whom there is 'more colour, music and passion' than in any other of his time. But why is Léonard ignored? Miss Butler is very flattering to myself in referring

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

the reader to my *French Literary Studies* in this and in another connection.

I do not propose to enter into the detail of the second volume, devoted to the nineteenth century. It provides an excellent account of the various movements, on a scale somewhat fuller than that of the first volume. I have noted no important omissions. Where other historians are apt to fail, Miss Butler has scored. She includes Nodier, Gérard de Nerval, and has adequate accounts of Baudelaire and Verlaine, as well as Rimbaud and Villiers de l'Isle-Adam. Jean Moréas is, however, inadequately treated. He was a very great poet within his narrow range and should not have been relegated to a footnote (p. 314). It is refreshing, however, to find Mallarmé, Samain and M. Henri de Régnier treated with some degree of sufficiency. I should have liked more than a reference to M. F. Vielé-Griffin and to Stuart Merrill. I find no mention whatever of Barbey d'Aurevilly, surely a very remarkable omission.

There are excellent bibliographies at the end of each volume and two indices, to Vol. I and to both volumes together, and also synoptic Chronological Tables. It would be too long a task to suggest additional references in the bibliographies which are, on the whole, well-chosen. I should have liked to see M. Chamard's excellent work included among the references for the sixteenth century, as well as Mrs Rachel Annand-Taylor's *Aspects of the Italian Renaissance* which gives by far the best general view of the period since Symonds and Pater, in English.

T. B. RUDMOSE-BROWN.

DUBLIN.

EGINHARD, *Vie de Charlemagne*. Éditée et traduite par LOUIS HALPHEN. (*Les Classiques de l'histoire de France au moyen âge*, I.) Paris: H. Champion. 1923. 8vo. xxiii + 127 pp. 7 fr. 50.

This little volume is the first to appear of a series comprising editions and translations of the most important documents dealing with the history of France from the time of the great invasions to the end of the fifteenth century. The series, which is a parallel series to *Les Classiques Français du Moyen Age*, is intended, not for the historian only, but also for the general reader who desires to obtain a clearer idea of the past history of France. Eginhard possesses a peculiar interest for the student of French literature also, as his chronicle contains the famous description of the battle of Roncesvalles, sole historical basis of the legend of Roncevaux.

Eginhard should have possessed unique value for the historian of that period had his accuracy been proportionate to his opportunity. A contemporary of the later years of Charlemagne, brought up with the emperor's children, with a first-hand knowledge of the family life as well as the political life of his great patron, he only needed a faithful memory and average ability to produce an invaluable record for posterity. Unfortunately he allows his *Vita* to degenerate into a mere panegyric of

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Charlemagne, and his inaccuracies are legion, even when he is merely transcribing the phrases of Suetonius, or of the Annalist who served as a model for his biography. M. Halphen points out that his chief source was the *Annales regi Francorum*, which he followed slavishly—'bien des pages de son opuscule prennent l'aspect d'un simple centon, où les phrases de l'annaliste alternent avec celles de Suétone.' Many of his inaccuracies have been pointed out by M. Halphen in some very useful notes at the bottom of each page of his excellent translation.

The Introduction gives us a brief description of Eginhard's method and his manner of dealing with the sources at his disposal. Of the numerous manuscripts which exist and which attest the popularity of his work, M. Halphen has selected five, dating from the ninth to the tenth century, which represent between them the three large classes into which the mass of manuscripts can be subdivided. Of these five, the MS. A^1 (MS. 510 of the National Library at Vienna) has furnished the orthography of the Latin text which M. Halphen has printed side by side with the translation. A list of editions and translations has been added, also a list of some of the numerous works which have been written on the subject. Professor A. J. Grant's *Early Lives of Charlemagne*, a pleasant translation of Eginhard's *Vita* and of the *Monk of St Gall* published by Messrs Chatto and Windus in their *Medieval Library*, which M. Halphen regrets having been unable to consult (probably because it was out of print for a couple of years), should have been included under the *translations* and not under the *editions*.

The present volume makes us look forward with pleasure to the rest of the series, of which we note that M. Halphen's edition and translation of the *Annales regi Francorum*, Eginhard's model and source, is to be one of the first to appear.

JESSIE CROSLAND.

LONDON.

Die Liederhandschrift des Cardinals de Rohan (XV. Jahrh.). Herausg. von MARTIN LÖPELMANN. (*Gesellschaft für romanische Literatur*, Bd. XLIV.) Göttingen (Halle: M. Niemeyer). 1923. 8vo. xxii + 428 pp. 20 M.

The manuscript here published for the first time in its entirety by Herr Löpelmann has had a varied history. The poems which form its contents were in all probability collected in the first instance by 'Amiral de France' Louis Malet de Graville (died 1516). From him they seem to have passed into the possession of his daughter Anne, and at some later period into that of Cardinal Maximilien de Rohan (died 1749, Bishop of Strassburg in 1740). After being completely lost sight of for over a century, the manuscript reappeared in 1882 in London in the sale catalogue of the Hamilton Collection, on which occasion it was purchased by the Berlin Königliche Bibliothek. This latter institution handed the manuscript over to the Berlin Kupferstichkabinett for the sake of its binding and miniature; there it lay hidden until 1913, when it was dis-

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

covered by Siegfried Lemm, who was prevented by his death—he fell in the war in 1915—from carrying out his intention of publishing the long-lost manuscript. Herr Löpelmann has now undertaken the task and has published the manuscript *in extenso*.

The literary value of the manuscript as a whole is not easy to appreciate on account of the extreme variety of its contents. In spite of the statement on fol. 3, v.: 'ces vers sont faitz par François Villon,' only a very few of the poems came from Villon's pen; other well-known poets of the late fourteenth and the fifteenth centuries have also contributed their quota. Charles d'Orléans, Philippe de Vitri, Alain Chartier and others of his school are represented. The poems belonging to these authors have of course been published in the editions of their works, and some hundred others have also seen the light in an early printed book published in 1500 under the title of *Le Jardin de Plaisance et Fleur de Rhétorique* (Facs. éd. Société des Anc. Textes, Paris, 1910), but the vast majority appear here for the first time. Few of the poems have a really popular character, and for this reason we find very few identical with any of those published by Gaston Paris (*Chansons du xv^e^ siècle*), and, where the same song does occur in both collections, it may be in quite a different form (cf. Rohan MS. 139, Gaston Paris, p. 71, *Mon seul plaisir, ma doulce joye*).

Herr Löpelmann has divided his book into two sections: (1) Ballades, (2) Rondeaux et Chansons, the latter being by far the more numerous. The editor has reproduced the original text as it stands, with its abbreviations and its scribal errors; he has, however, furnished the poems with titles briefly indicating their contents, in deference to the intention of the friend whose task he carried out. This plan does not strike us as a very happy one, especially in the case of well-known poems such as the *Dit de Franc Gontier* entitled *Im Wald und auf der Heide*, and of some in which the title has a humorous ring such as *Liebesnautik* (No. 81) and *Feuerwerk* (No. 90). This is a small point, however, and Herr Löpelmann has performed a useful task in reproducing faithfully a manuscript which will be of considerable value to the future historian of the poetry of the fifteenth century, whether or not the final words of the preface be justified: 'Unser Kodex ist *die* französische Liederhandschrift des 15. Jahrhunderts, sie mag nun ästhetisch befriedigen oder nicht.'

JESSIE CROSLAND.

LONDON.

ARTURO FARINELLI. *Dante in Spagna, Francia, Inghilterra, Germania* (*Dante e Goethe*). Turin: Bocca. 1922. 8vo. ix + 506 pp. 40 lire.

Professor Farinelli defines these studies as 'frammenti di storie varie di una varia fortuna.' The 'fortuna' of Dante, his influence upon the literature of his own and other European nations, the vicissitudes of his fame in Italy and among those alien lands in which he would fain not have the sense of his canzoni expounded where their beauty could not

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

be perceived, 'a gente d'altra lingua, sì come a Tedeschi e Inghilesi e altri' (*Conv.* I. 7), makes a story which would be difficult to parallel in the case of other poets of the modern world. Its length and breadth are inevitable; for, as Dante fully realised when he found himself 'sesto tra cotanto senno' (*Inf.* IV. 102), he was the first vernacular poet to become a classic, the first 'dicitore per rima' to win his place as an equal with the standard poets of antiquity who 'magni sermone et arte regulari poetati sunt' (*V.E.* II. 4). Hence the rich field that is opened to the investigator who sets himself to the fascinating if laborious task, as Professor Farinelli puts it, 'a seguire, di popolo in popolo, di secolo in secolo, le orme lasciate dallo spirito di Dante, e le vicende della gloria sua' (p. 5). The results naturally tend to become the accumulation of particulars of unequal value, but an eloquent preliminary essay (one of the addresses delivered on the occasion of the sixth centenary), *Riflessi di Dante nei secoli*, lifts the whole subject on to a higher plane than that of mere erudition.

The first section, *Dante in Ispagna nell' Età Media*, an original and exhaustive study, will strike many readers as the most novel and valuable portion of the work. A minor point in itself, but of peculiar interest to the student of the *Rime*, is the evidence that Dante's great canzone, 'Tre donne intorno al cor mi son venute,' which Coleridge claimed to begin to understand after years of repeated study, was known and appreciated by Spaniards at an early date; Professor Farinelli (pp. 111–113) shows that it was imitated in an allegorical poem of Alfonso Alvarez de Villasandino in 1407, and again in the *Vision* of the Marques de Santillana. The three allegorical women in the latter suggest the analogous Franciscan vision which (through Bonaventura rather than directly from Thomas of Celano) gave perhaps more to Dante's canzone than did *Lo dolz chans* of Giraut de Borneil. *Dante e la Francia* is on a slighter scale, professedly a supplement to the two volumes with the same title that the author has published elsewhere. Reviewers in the *Bullettino della Società Dantesca Italiana* have privileges of space to be envied by their English brethren. *Dante in Inghilterra* (*Dal Chaucer al Cary*) is the amplification of such a review of Dr Paget Toynbee's two volumes, *Dante in English Literature*, and the Italian scholar's indefatigable researches have succeeded in making not a few additions even to that vast collection of English references and echoes, together with a critical survey of the result. But is there really any 'ricordo a Dante' in Coleridge's *Hymn before Sunrise* (p. 271)? In any case, the influence of Dante was *vital nutrimento* to none of our poets in the same degree as it was to Shelley: 'Lo Shelley è tra i pochissimi, forse il solo in Inghilterra, che senta in sè Dante come fuoco divino' (p. 322). The chronological limits of the study naturally exclude Dante Gabriel Rossetti. The final section, *Dante in Germania* (*nel secolo di Goethe*) and *Dante e Goethe*, closes in a singularly penetrating study of the attitude of Goethe towards Dante, or, as the author prefers to call it, 'un raffronto tra il mondo della poesia di Dante e quello, diversissimo, della poesia di Goethe.' The book, with its masses

Digitized by Google

Original from
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

of details and references, is not easy reading, but it is a substantial and valuable addition to the library of the student of Dante.

EDMUND G. GARDNER.

LONDON.

BERNARDIM RIBEIRO e CRISTOVÃO FALCÃO. *Obras.* Nova edição, conforme a edição de Ferrara. Preparada e revista por ANSELMO BRAAMCAMP FREIRE, e prefaciada por D. CAROLINA MICHAËLIS DE VASCONCELOS. 2 vols. Coimbra: Imprensa de Universidade. 1923. 8vo. 322 and 334 pp. 50.000 réis.

Portuguese literature would be more frequently studied, perhaps, were it realized that, apart from intrinsic merits, it furnishes many very interesting problems, some of which are so evenly poised that they are capable of providing almost as much uncertainty as the doctrines of freewill and predestination themselves. Bernardim Ribeiro, the unfortunate genius (1482–1552) who was one of the forerunners of the modern novel and also introduced bucolic poetry in a new and original form, provides two such problems. Was he the author of the Second Part of his novel *Menina e Moça?* Was he the author of the eclogue *Crisfal?* Sr Delfim Guimarães in 1908 forcibly insisted that Cristovam Falcam did not exist as a poet and that this celebrated eclogue, so similar to those of Bernardim Ribeiro and to nothing else in Portuguese literature, was the work of Ribeiro. Sr Guimarães had a strong case, but the arguments adduced in its support were weak. The real argument was the amazing similarity of the very individual style. This argument, however, loses something of its weight from the fact that Falcam was Ribeiro's junior by some thirty years and from the very individuality of Ribeiro's eclogues, which would the more easily encourage imitation and in the hands of a genius might give rise to a masterpiece in the same style. Two Swinburnes in 1866 would no doubt be something of a miracle; but it would not have been so marvellous had one of his many imitators before the end of the century produced a poem of genius in a style which future critics could scarcely distinguish from that of Swinburne. The new edition of Ribeiro's works is due to the late Portuguese scholar and historian, Sr Anselmo Braamcamp Freire, who had the entire 1554 edition photographed from the only known copy, that of the British Museum, but died before the new edition could appear. The text (168 ff.) occupies the second volume; the first is devoted entirely to the introduction written by Professor Carolina Michaëlis de Vasconcelos. It is nearly sixty years ago since her first volume appeared, and it already gave evidence of mature scholarship and profound learning. If time has added to the scholarship and to the stores of erudition, it has taken away nothing from this great humanist's clearness of vision, subtlety of argument and astonishing vigour.

The 1554 (Ferrara) edition prints only the first seventeen chapters of the Second Part of *Menina e Moça*, and D. Carolina Michaëlis is

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

strongly of opinion that the first seventeen or nineteen chapters only are the work of Ribeiro, the remainder being apocryphal. Most critics are agreed that the first portion of the Second Part is genuine, since chapter XI contains the hauntingly beautiful *romance* 'Pola ribeira de um rio,' the simple genius of which stamps it as the work of Ribeiro. Judging by the style, it is difficult to draw a line after chapter XVII. The unknown continuer must have studied Ribeiro's style very carefully, but gradually lost its pensive grace and ended the story in jejune barrenness. The same might happen if the author himself were continuing the story in a tired, overwrought state. At first we have passages and phrases which are decidedly Ribeiresque ; e.g. in cap. 21: 'mas em nenhuma cousa deste mundo ha segurança nem se deve ter' (cf. the end of Part I: 'se em alguma cousa deste mundo houvera segurança'); cap. 22: 'tanto pode o nojo em tudo; pondo-se ao pé de uma fonte com o pensamento todo ocupado naquela agoa; erros de amor são dinos de perdoar'; cap. 23: 'veio ter sobre tarde (quando as aves se começam a recolher a seus costumados pousos) a um valle,' etc.

The 1554 edition contains the Crisfal eclogue, as 'de Cristouam Falcam,' although the index (see vol. II, p. 2), more doubtful, has 'que dizem ser de,' which is repeated in the 1559 edition. The study of this intricate question is naturally given a large place in the introduction. Why, asks D. Carolina Michaëlis, was there no protest from Sá de Miranda against the ascription of the poem to Falcam if it was the work of his old friend Ribeiro? The poem was omitted in the 1557 edition of Ribeiro's works. The poem is the work of a young man, and Ribeiro was over fifty when it first saw the light anonymously between 1536 and 1547. There is great resemblance, but there are also dissimilarities between the style and outlook of *Crisfal* and the Ribeiro eclogues (see Introdução, pp. 293–295). After marshalling the facts in favour of the tradition of three and a half centuries with her wonted learning and insight, D. Carolina Michaëlis stands aside and leaves the verdict to the reader. It is probable that he will begin by congratulating the famous critic on this new exhibition of her powers, and that, without entirely dismissing the problem from his mind, he will for the present, and until further proof be adduced to the contrary, restore Cristovam Falcam to his place, a very high place, among the poets of the Peninsula.

AUBREY F. G. BELL.

S. JOÃO DO ESTORIL, PORTUGAL.

Goethe. By BENEDETTO CROCE. Translated into English. With an Introduction by DOUGLAS AINSLIE. London: Methuen and Co. 1923. xix + 208 pp. 7*s.* 6*d.*

This translation of a book on Goethe by the philosopher whose studies of Dante, Ariosto, Shakespeare and Corneille are already well known in England should be welcomed by English readers. The original essay appeared in 1919, together with a selection of Goethe's lyrics translated (with consummate skill) into Italian; and in his Preface

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Signor Croce explains the motive which led him to express some critical ideas on Goethe, after he had re-read the poet's works 'during the sad days of the world war...and gained deeper consolation and greater courage from him than I could have gained perhaps in equal measure from any other poet.'

The outstanding feature of Signor Croce's study—as might be expected from his other writings—is the resolute rejection of the usual 'Goethe-literature,' and thus of all biographical explanation of Goethe's work. Biographical research, he insists, stifles pure artistic consideration, which is the proper task of literary history. Similarly, in his study of Ariosto, he defines the critical and historical judgment (distinct from the aesthetic or intuitive apprehension of a work of art) as the ability to 'determine the character of the inspiration that moved Ariosto, his dominant poetical motive, the peculiar effect which became poetry in him.' (*Ariosto, Shakespeare and Corneille*, trd. by Douglas Ainslie, London, 1921, p. 5.) 'Erroneous philology,' he says in the essay on Shakespeare, 'confounding art and document,...transports into art whatever it has discovered or believes itself to have discovered by means of research' (*ibid.*, p. 133). It is this confusion of 'art and document,' especially notable in Goethe-literature, and perhaps traceable in part to the large proportion of documentary evidence in the poet's own writings, which Signor Croce sets out to combat. His weapons are effective; abandoning destructive criticism, he substitutes for documents an appreciation of Goethe's artistic development and poetical life which is at once amazing in its freshness and convincing in its penetration.

The fact of cardinal importance immediately emphasized is Goethe's transition from the restless frame of mind of his youth to the tranquil harmony of almost all the later works. But we are warned not to picture this transition as 'a leap over an abyss, which suddenly opened up before him'; and this warning is justified by an acute analysis of the works belonging to Goethe's early period. Signor Croce insists that the transition was fundamentally an ethical one, and only indirectly of a literary character, and rejects the theory of external causes (supported to some extent by Goethe himself) which would explain it by the journey to Italy, 'where,' as he justly says, 'so many others have gone, but where no one else has reaped the harvest that Goethe did; Italy and Greece are...mere symbols of his inner life.'

This general section of the book gives the key to the subsequent chapters on individual works. No chronological arrangement is followed; the works are grouped, as are the plays in the essay on Shakespeare, on the principle that the growth of the spirit is the only criterion for their consideration. Thus *Werther* is first treated, as the earliest work of 'liberation'—a term which reminds us of the principle expressed in the *Aesthetic*, that 'by elaborating his impressions, man *frees* himself from them. By objectifying them, he removes them from him and makes himself their superior'—a function of art which belongs to its character of activity. (*Aesthetic as Science of Expression*, etc., trd. by Douglas Ainslie, London, 1909, p. 35.) This conception of expression as activity

Digitized by Google Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

implies as its corollary the unity and indivisibility of a work of art (*ibid.*); and this is one of the chief points which Signor Croce emphasizes when he condemns the biographical criticism of *Werther*. Here are no 'artistic discordances' for biographical genesis to explain; therefore it 'appears incongruous and strange when applied to works in which personal experiences have become completely fused in the artistic idea.' *Werther* represents 'not a malady, but the recovery from a malady, a vaccination fever....' A different view appears in the chapters on *Faust* which follow. A delightful sketch of 'Wagner the pedant' leads to a consideration of the 'Faust of poetry' who is contrasted with 'the other Faust, the Faust of the whole poem, [who] is little more than a concept of the intellect, worked out, moreover, inconsistently' (p. 53). An interesting parallel may be found in the essay on Ariosto (*ed. cit.*, p. 84), where *Faust* is instanced as a work in which the 'general composition, which is more or less guided by mental concepts, does not at all coincide with the poetical inspiration of the parts.' The Faust of poetry resembles Werther and represents the crisis of modern thought; and the expression of this in poetry is immortal. At the same time, the First Part of *Faust* is to a certain extent inspired by the same feeling for mediaeval figures and scenes which led Goethe to write *Götz von Berlichingen*; and the short analysis of these elements in Faust's character is a most interesting piece of criticism, followed by an appreciative treatment of the Gretchen tragedy. In the chapter on 'The systematic form of *Faust I* and the double form of *Wilhelm Meister*,' an idea important in all Signor Croce's critical work is illustrated—the antithesis between organism and mechanism. Analytical criticism of *Faust*, he contends, is justified precisely because, far from destroying a poetical organism, it liberates the diverse living organisms which the poet, by a 'reflective method,' has forced into a mechanism. Goethe, in fact, re-elaborated *Faust* in order to 'answer with a poetical work the question as to the value, or rather the aim, of human life.' This is a problem proper to philosophy, or rather to criticism, Signor Croce argues, but it cannot be solved by imagination and is therefore not poetical. A similar objection applies even more strongly to *Wilhelm Meisters Lehrjahre*.

In a discussion of the 'Historical and Ethical dramas' it is of interest to note the links between Signor Croce's essay *Of History* and his criticism of *Götz* and *Egmont*, in which he justly refers to the 'historicity' of these two dramas as a 'merely decorative element of a world more or less human.' An interesting contrast is pointed in the succeeding chapters between the revivification of Greek art in Goethe's *Helena*—a conception combining ancient myth and modern idea, and expressing 'Beauty, enchantment, intoxication, perdition' (p. 123)—and the 'embellishing of classic forms with a new content' with which the poet amused himself in *Hermann und Dorothea*. Signor Croce's view of the latter poem is particularly refreshing after the laudatory comments of most critics. 'This does not imply,' he says, 'that *Hermann und Dorothea* is not, within its own limits, a charming poem, but merely

Digitized by Google

Original from
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

that it is necessary to resign oneself to this fact and to consider the poem as it is in reality' (p. 129).

Criticism of the *Wanderjahre* is equally frank; the *Wahlverwandtschaften*, to which a chapter is devoted, seems to the critic to be 'the last dramatic creation which Goethe really lived through and transmuted into poetry' (p. 168), and after it, he insists, the reader must look for something other than poetic transfiguration. The final chapter on the Second Part of *Faust* elaborates this idea, and presents a finely balanced view of the attributes of the great work. The Second Part should be judged, Signor Croce maintains, as a work entirely apart from the other *Faust*, as a kind of operatic libretto embodying the rich experience of the old artist, whose wisdom 'is often softened by a smile.' To those who seek for a consistent plán and inner unity in the whole work Signor Croce offers no comfort. A certain unity, extrinsic and general, he admits; but 'the true artistic unity lies...in the half-jesting tone...which prevails...in the various parts' (p. 185). Nor will he admit great philosophical depth in the Second Part of *Faust*, since it is and remains poetry, though of a limited kind, and the ideas in it are therefore not thought out, but only referred to. It should be read as a storehouse, from which stray treasures may be picked at will; only thus can it be enjoyed 'in accordance with the spirit of its author... free...from the tumult of passion, free too from the strain of art'; and the critic ends with a brave sentence: '*Faust II* is not a lamentable document of the senile decay of a genius, but a crackling of sparks when a great fire dies out, the rich close of a superlatively rich poetical and mental life' (p. 197). In these words Signor Croce's figure of Goethe lives before us in his age, just as did the young, vivid poet of *Werther* in the earlier chapters; and indeed, to read this study is to see, with a new vision, one of the great poets.

The translation, by Miss Emily Anderson, is in general vivid and accurate (apart from what is presumably a printer's error on p. 76, making 'di amorale superiorità' into 'of a moral superiority'). If occasionally the slightly humorous turn of phrase of the Italian is lost, on the other hand many passages shew skilful manipulation and concise expression; and the English version runs smoothly and pleasantly throughout.

EDNA PURDIE.

BANGOR, NORTH WALES.

Goethes Faust. Kritisch durchgesehen, eingeleitet und erläutert von ROBERT PETSCH. Leipzig: Bibliographisches Institut. 1924. 8vo. 628 pp. 6 M.

A little volume of *Vorträge über Goethes Faust* (Würzburg, 1903), which Professor Robert Petsch delivered more than twenty years ago before an audience of teachers in a holiday course, has always seemed to me one of the most helpful of introductions to the study of Goethe's poem; and now he gives us the ripe summary of his labours on *Faust* in an edition which is indispensable to all who would be abreast of

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

the *Faust* scholarship of our time. The publishers have produced a volume exemplary in its clear typography and tasteful binding; but, evidently alarmed at its size, they have set the notes in a letterpress so minute as to be exceedingly trying to the eyes. And it is just these notes that are for the *Faust* student of particular value. *Faust* has been commented on times innumerable, but Professor Petsch has succeeded, notwithstanding, in imparting remarkable freshness to his commentary; he has avoided repeating familiar things, and his careful bibliographical references take count of all that recent years have brought forth in elucidation of the poem. Perhaps size was also a reason for the omission from the volume of the *Urfaust*, although the *Paralipomena* are included.

An Introduction of only some fifty pages has imposed some self-denial on the editor, especially as, in accordance with a perhaps questionable precedent, it takes stock of the whole field of *Faust* study from the early Christian predecessors of Faust onwards. It is difficult to see how more could have been crowded into these pages; but it might have been better to keep the 'Vorgeschichte' (Professor Petsch seems to me, by the way, to be unduly severe on the Spiess *Faust-Book*—'ein im ganzen herzlich langweiliges Erzeugnis') within stricter bounds, and saved space for a less concentrated discussion of Goethe's poem. His scrutiny of the growth of the *Urfaust* is excellent, although I find it difficult to accept the conclusion that Helena had a place in Goethe's very oldest *Faust* plan; perhaps best of all is the clear delimitation of the range of the 'Italian *Faust*.' Too many *Faust* commentators of the past, in their zeal to demonstrate the unity of the poem, have glossed over the poet's changing attitude towards its central problems. The strength of Professor Petsch's Introduction lies just in his clear presentation of the evolution of *Faust* in Goethe's mind. On the Second Part he is free from that note of indiscriminate acceptance with which it used to be considered proper to speak of Goethe's 'crowning achievement.'

> Wir müssen uns eingestehen, dass dem greisen Dichter oft genug der Faden der Handlung im eigentlichen Sinn aus den Händen glitt und dass seine gestaltende Kraft nicht selten hinter der grossen 'Intention' zurückblieb. Weite Strecken hindurch will der 'Zweite Faust' gelesen und genossen werden, wie ein gedankenschweres Gedicht von Schiller, etwa wie 'Ideal und Leben.' Dann aber enthüllt er auch dem willigen, reifen und ästhetisch empfänglichen Leser Akt für Akt eine Fülle von Schönheiten, die vielleicht unsere Zeit besser zu würdigen weiss als die Vergangenheit.

This is wise criticism; but it is also a confession that much of the poem transcends the limits of living and immediately effective poetry. The general impression of the Second Part is excellently summed up in the sentence: 'Es ist, als ob ein allmächtiger Marionettenspieler die Fäden in der Hand hielte und die Figuren lenkte.' The bloodless unreality of the allegorical shadows to which, alas, Goethe in his old age entrusted the consummation of his 'Divine Comedy' could hardly be better expressed.

J. G. Robertson.

London.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

De Sage van den Vliegenden Hollander naar Behandeling, Orsprong en zin Onderzocht. Door G. KALFF, Jr. Zutphen: W. J. Thieme en Cie. 1923. 8vo. ix + 196 pp. 3 fl. 90.

Dr G. Kalff has, in the present study, made the first attempt to deal in a comprehensive way with the exceedingly elusive saga of the 'Flying Dutchman.' In his task he has been largely aided by the valuable compendium of sea-legend compiled by the American writer, Fletcher S. Bassett, in 1885: *Legends and Superstitions of the Sea in all Lands*, and supplemented by his son, Wilbur Fletcher, in 1917, with his *Folk Stories of the Sea, with Notes upon their Origin.* These works have provided a very large proportion of Dr Kalff's materials; and, following them, he has extended his investigation—it is inherent in the elusiveness of the theme—far beyond the limits of the Flying Dutchman story in its concrete form; he has much to say of the magic and the mystery of the sea in widely different manifestations. This adds to the general interest of the volume, but, as a literary study, it might have benefited by stricter delimitation. We could certainly have dispensed with the final chapter, in which, calling in the aid of psycho-analysis, Dr Kalff generalises on the ultimate spiritual—and even political—significance of the saga. This recalls unpleasantly the bad old days when Siegfried was only a sun-god, and primitive and legendary literature was confused with mythological speculation.

Dr Kalff's survey of the Flying Dutchman literature deals in almost excessive detail with the available English records; on the other hand, a fresh survey of Scandinavian literature and folklore would, I think, have provided a richer harvest than Dr Kalff collects, both in respect of the 'Dødsseiler'—the specific Scandinavian form of the saga—and of sinister and mysterious sea-legends in general.

On certain fundamental questions Dr Kalff's treatise is a little unsatisfying. He brings us no nearer to a settlement of the original shaping of the Dutchman saga. His evidence is presumptive of English origin during the Anglo-Dutch rivalry on the seas in the seventeenth century; but it would have been a great gain, could he have brought this evidence to a more definite focus. The localisation of the crucial happenings of the saga off the Cape of Good Hope is perhaps most convincingly justified. He complains, however, that the evidence is so widely separated in time and space that it is difficult to draw definite inferences concerning the evolution of the saga; but more, I think, might have been done with his materials in this direction. He is not able, any more than his predecessors, to explain how the hero came by his name Vanderdecken: 'somebody else may solve this question; I see no chance, with my materials, of doing it' (p. 111). Too frequently this *non possumus* attitude brings Dr Kalff's investigations to an abrupt conclusion.

Coming to literary adaptations of the saga, one naturally turns with particular interest to the account of its two most famous poetic embodiments, Heine's version, and the opera of Richard Wagner. There are

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

several problems awaiting solution here, which might have tempted a new investigator. That Heine's circumstantial account of the performance of a Flying Dutchman drama in Amsterdam is as unsubstantial as the Dutchman himself, is, I think, generally accepted; but Dr Kalff might have helped us, who have not access to Amsterdam theatre-records, by telling us quite definitely that no performance, whether by Dutch or by foreign actors ever took place there, such as might have suggested Heine's story. That, too, Heine deserves the credit of elaborating the saga as we find it in his *Schnabelewopski*, and as it passed on to Wagner, is not nowadays disputed. But Dr Kalff might have here gone into the question of possible English influence, especially as he is disposed to grant its likelihood. The matter was ingeniously, if a little flippantly, discussed by Mr Ashton Ellis in an article in the Wagnerian periodical *The Meister*, in 1892, in which it was put almost beyond dispute that Heine could not have seen Fitzball's Adelphi drama, *The Flying Dutchman, or The Phantom Ship*, when he was in London. Fitzball, however, deserves a little more careful looking into than Dr Kalff vouchsafes him, in spite of the trashiness of his play. Produced at the Adelphi Theatre in June 1825, it was revived in December 1826, and enjoyed great popularity both there and in the English provinces in 1826 and 1827; it reappeared in 1829, and again as late as 1856. It was also, I gather from Bassett, popular in New York. It was published as 'a Nautical Drama' with a prefatory notice of a couple of pages by 'D—G.' in Volume II of Cumberland's *Minor Theatre* in 1829. Fitzball is stated here to have founded his play on a story in *Blackwood's Magazine* for May 1821 ('Vanderdecken's Message Home; or the Tenacity of Natural Affection'); and the playbill, where it is described as 'a new Nautical Burletta,' also, as Mr Ellis tells us, states its indebtedness. But the brief account in *Blackwood* of Vanderdecken trying to induce an English ship to take home letters to Holland, is only utilised in a few lines of the play, and can in no sense be described as its source. Although Heine may not have seen Fitzball's *Flying Dutchman*, it is not impossible that he may have read it; it is true, the edition just referred to is too late; but an anonymous print, where it is entitled 'a Grand Melo-Dramatic Romance in Three Acts,' obviously predates the edition with the author's name in Cumberland's series; the British Museum Catalogue tentatively suggests 1827. Moreover, Mr Ellis says: 'If we confine our attention to London alone, and to the year 1827, we shall find that the metropolis simply bristled with Flying Dutchmen and women.' The student of Heine cannot ignore this fact.

Dr Kalff mentions a piece by Douglas Jerrold, *The Flying Dutchman*, produced unsuccessfully in 1829, and never printed; it would have been interesting to obtain some further information about it from contemporary reports. To his survey of English literature might be added several later items, admittedly of the smallest literary value. *Vanderdecken, or The Flying Dutchman*, a Romance of the Ocean by the author of *Tom King*, etc., was published in 1851. According to the Preface,

Digitized by Google Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

the author's aim has been to 'steer clear of his predecessors who have made use of the legend, by taking fresh ground and diving, as it were, into the domestic life of the merchant princes of Amsterdam.' It ends with the saving of the spectral Dutchman's soul by the heroine. A flagrant plagiarism of Fitzball's piece, a reduction of it to narrative, *The Flying Dutchman, or The Phantom Ship*, was published anonymously and without date, but, to judge from the advertisements on the cover of the British Museum copy, in the early fifties. *The Flying Dutchman, or the Demon Seaman*, a burlesque by W. Brough, was produced in December 1869, and *Vanderdecken*, a drama by W. G. Wills and P. Fitzgerald, at the Lyceum on June 8, 1878.

Interesting problems arise in connection with Wagner's opera, *The Flying Dutchman*. Wagner could not have been entirely ignorant of Fitzball's shocking 'grand melodramatic romance': it is impossible to explain away the similarity of situation—the Dutchman's picture on the wall, the heroine's ballad while her maid works, the sudden appearance of the Dutchman himself—in the beginning of the second act of both dramas. Mr Ellis's arguments to the contrary are not convincing, being mainly based on the feeling that there is some disgrace involved when a poet one admires stoops to 'take his good where he finds it.' It might be suggested that Wagner—even if he never set eyes on Fitzball's piece—read some account of it in a German periodical which published reports of the English theatres. But the Flying Dutchman legend provides little dramatic backbone, and it is possible that Wagner was also influenced by Hoffmann's *Bergwerke zu Falun*, where a Swedish mariner returns from long voyagings to experience a similar emotional tragedy to that in the opera. We might thus see in *The Flying Dutchman* another illustration of that blending of two different sagas, with which the poet-musician achieved his greatest triumphs as a constructive dramatist. But this is perhaps hardly relevant to a review of Dr Kalff's attractive book, which merits the careful attention of all able to read Dutch, and are interested in those fascinating sagas of the sea which are more essentially flesh and blood of the English people than of any other nationality.

LONDON. J. G. ROBERTSON.

Periods of Polish Literary History. By ROMAN DYBOSKI. London: Oxford University Press. 8vo. 163 pp. 6*s*.

Modern Polish Literature. By ROMAN DYBOSKI. London: Oxford University Press. 8vo. 130 pp. 6*s*.

In 1922–3 Prof. Roman Dyboski, Professor of English Literature at the University of Cracow, delivered as Reader in the School of Slavonic Studies at the University of London a course of lectures on Polish literature at King's College, and in 1923 gave the Ilchester lectures at Oxford, also on Polish literature. It is these two courses of lectures that are here published in two most attractive little volumes by the Oxford University Press.

Digitized by Google Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

It is to be feared that the average English reader's knowledge of Polish literature stops with the name of the greatest novelist of Poland, Sienkiewicz, who is known to the British public merely as the author of one, and that not his best, book. To such readers Prof. Dyboski's account of a literature that can hold its own in comparison with that of the other nations of Europe will come as a revelation. The author takes us through its successive stages, beginning with that of the sixteenth century which, enriched by the culture of Humanism and the Renaissance, has been called the golden period of Polish literature, through the satires and political writings of the eighteenth century and the sparkling comedies of Fredro, the Polish Molière, until we reach the great romantic revival of the nineteenth century, influenced like the other European literatures of the period by Byron, but soon revealing its own peculiar orientation, that of a noble patriotic school rooted in the national suffering. All through the history of post-partitioned Poland the national literature without detriment to its high artistic quality was at once the inspirer, the conscience and the salvation of an oppressed country: it did not cease to carry out this function, on fresh lines, when the age of Romanticism yielded to that of Realism, in the close of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth century. The immense field that Prof. Dyboski's books therefore cover is apparent. His narrative has all the clarity and discrimination requisite in the supremely exacting undertaking of compressing such a subject into the dimensions at his disposal: on the other hand it is full of the vivid and picturesque details that distinguish it from a mere summary. The author's method in dealing with a national literature that is as closely intertwined with the national history as is Poland's is best illustrated by his summing up at the end of the volume, *Periods of Polish Literary History*.

'It may seem at best one-sided literary history which connects literature, as I have too often endeavoured to connect it, with the background of national and political history more closely than with dominant literary and artistic tendencies of the epoch...But it is difficult to resist the power of social and historical associations when considering literature in this troubled, anxious and unsettled new Europe of ours...Values higher and more comprehensive than purely artistic ones are in the forefront of our attention now in studying yesterday, because they are at stake to-day, and must be rescued for to-morrow. Literature saved the Polish nation in the nineteenth century, it may be called to do its share towards saving European civilization in the twentieth.' (pp. 159 f.)

Prof. Dyboski cannot however be accused of sacrificing the literary and artistic side of his theme.

Especially attractive in the first volume is the author's account of two widely differing giant figures of sixteenth-century Polish literature, Kochanowski and Skarga: the first named, the golden-tongued poet, one of the earliest Polish poets to write of nature, anticipating what afterwards became a characteristic feature of Polish literature; who, in Prof. Dyboski's words, 'walks down the path of life singing' (p. 21), and whose famous lamentations for a dead child ring down the centuries in

Digitized by Google

Original from
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

the human accents of grief and bereavement: the Jesuit Skarga, who foretold almost word for word the fall of Poland, and whose impassioned sermons before the Polish Diet have something of the grandeur of the Hebrew prophets of the Old Testament. In the second volume, *Modern Polish Literature*, we would single out Prof. Dyboski's particularly illuminating summary of a poet both baffling and enchanting, Wyspianski, the writer of glowing and elusive symbolic drama who is also the painter of the wonderful stained glass in the Franciscan church at Cracow. Prof. Dyboski carries his story down to the present day, and the reader is made familiar with the names and characteristics of Poland's living writers no less than with those of the past. We owe Prof. Dyboski a real debt of gratitude for his contribution to the history of a noble literature that is deplorably, and indeed unaccountably, neglected in this country, to the study of which these fascinating volumes should prove a powerful stimulus.

MONICA M. GARDNER.

LONDON.

MINOR NOTICES.

The Year's Work in English Studies is by way of becoming a national institution and the volume for 1922 (Oxford University Press, 1923, 7*s.* 6*d.*) is not less valuable than its predecessors. In eleven chapters the whole field of English studies is covered, an appreciation being given of each work and article mentioned. A new feature is a twelfth chapter by Mr Arundell Esdaile, giving an account of the chief book-sales in 1922. In view of the increasing complexity of English studies and the widening interest in English language and literature abroad, a record of this kind is a great boon. One only wonders how it was possible to do without it so long.

H. G. W.

The punctual arrival of the *Second Supplement* to Professor J. E. Wells' *Manual of the Writings in Middle English* (New Haven, Conn. The Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences. 1923. 118 pp. $1.50) is quite an event for English scholars. The period covered is from September, 1918, to January, 1923. There is a list of corrections made in the second printing of the *First Supplement*. Professor Wells repeats his request that students of Middle English should send him notice of their fresh work and, if possible, reprints of their articles, especially those in less accessible periodicals.

W. J. S.

Doctor-dissertations written by foreigners in English often make one regret that the author had not used his own language. This is not the case with Dr G. Dudok's *Sir Thomas More and his Utopia* (H. J. Paris, Amsterdam, xii + 220 pp.) which in spite of a very occasional

Digitized by Google Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

solecism is excellent reading. It is also sumptuously printed in quarto form. Dr Dudok analyses carefully the relation of the *Utopia* to Plato's *Republic* and shows that More's dependence on Plato is less than some critics have maintained. He says very truly: 'Plato is primarily and preeminently a philosopher, More a politician.' Especially interesting is one fact which Dr Dudok points out that while the framework of *Utopia* is clearly taken from the fourth of the *Quatuor Navigationes* of Amerigo Vespucci, the story of the first voyage may also have provided More with some fertile suggestions. Amerigo there states that he had met people who 'live in their own liberty...have no judicial system, but seldom or never did we see any dispute among them,' people who 'have no private property, but their dwellings are common, and every eight or ten years they change their place of habitation,' people who 'despise precious metals.' Dr Dudok shows the reality of the social evils of More's day by references to the *Letters and Papers* of Henry VIII's reign edited by Dr Brewer, and the existence of similar evils in the Middle Ages by references to the ballads and songs of the time. He prints extracts from More's *Apology* to show that in later life he was far from breathing the spirit of religious toleration he shows in *Utopia*, but he draws a beautiful picture of More's character as shown after his fall. He does not touch on the influence which the *Utopia* exerted on later literature.

The book gives few opportunities for picking holes. Mr 'H. de B. Gibbins,' however, is not correctly described as 'Mr De Gibbins,' in the first note on p. 26 'Henry VIII' should perhaps be 'Henry VII,' and a passage which Dr Dudok quotes from the *Apology* does not bear the interpretations which he puts upon it. More writes: 'let him...appere... before the kynges grace and his counsail and there...proue that any one of all these [heretics] had wronge, but if it were for that they were burned no sooner.' It is hardly a fair paraphrase to say: 'More declares that the only wrong ever done to heretics was "that they were burned no sooner"' (p. 163) or 'If he [More] were called before the King's grace and his counsel [?council], he would maintain [?deny] "that any one of all these had wronge, but if it were for that they were burned no sooner"' (p. 209).

G. C. M. S.

The long title, *The Compound Epithets of Shelley and Keats, considered from the structural, the historical, and the literary standpoints, with some comparisons, from the Greek, the Old English and the German*, gives a fair idea of this most painstaking book by Dr B. W. A. Massey (Poznan, 1923, 256 pp.). After some introductory remarks on the nature of compounds in general the author first gives an exhaustive enumeration of the compound adjectives found in Shelley's poetry arranged according to the manner of their formation (substantive + verbal with subordinate groups, e.g. *all-embracing*; *blood-reeking*; *air-clad*; *earth-born*; next substantive + adjective: *moon-proof*; *Actaeon-like*; then adverb, adjective, or substantive + verbal, etc.). These various

Digitized by Google

Original from
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

groups are then compared with corresponding Greek epithets, the writer displaying an extraordinary familiarity with Greek poetic literature. The question how Shelley dealt with actual Greek compounds when translating is illustrated by a comparison with the way in which the same poems were rendered by Chapman and by two German translators. Everywhere we find comprehensive statistics, even of how many of Shelley's epithets had been used before: the author must have looked up every single adjective in the *Oxford Dictionary*, and is even able in some cases to give earlier quotations than those there given. One chapter is devoted to Shelley's use of alliteration in compounds (*soul-sustaining*, etc., but is *isle-sustaining ocean-flood* alliterative?), and another distributes the adjectives according to the source from which the images are drawn (storm, tempest, etc.), leading up to final remarks on the relation of these adjectives to the general character of Shelley's poetry. The examination of Keats's compound epithets follows the same lines and shows some, though not much, difference between the two poets, especially in the spheres of thought and nature most fully represented. Statistics here confirm the general impression readers of the two poets had previously received. But it is surprising to see the general agreement between Keats's epithets and Greek ones, though the poet was not like Shelley directly influenced through reading Greek originals. Incidentally we get a full treatment of similar adjectives in *Beowulf*. The book must have cost the writer an inconceivable amount of work.

O. J.

One may perhaps be a fervent Wordsworthian without caring much for the Ecclesiastical Sonnets written when the poet had passed his fiftieth year. The more intensely one is stirred by *The Affliction of Margaret*, *The Education of Nature*, *The Ode to Duty*, *The Happy Warrior* or *The Sonnet on Westminster Bridge*, the more will one miss any corresponding witchcraft in the sonnet-series on the history of the Anglican Church. The sonnets on Walton's Lives and on King's College Chapel have the old quality: but they stand out almost alone from the tameness and conventionality of the rest. Undeterred however by the task he has undertaken, Mr A. F. Potts has produced a critical edition of *The Ecclesiastical Sonnets of William Wordsworth* (Cornell Studies in English. New Haven, Yale University Press; London: H. Milford. 1922. 12*s.* 6*d.*) which apparently says all that can be said on the subject. We have a history of the composition of the work, an account of the existing MSS., an apparatus of the variant readings of different editions, and notes in which most of the sonnets have a 'source' found for them in Bede, Fuller, Sharon Turner, Foxe, Burnet or some other writer. It cannot be said that any part of Mr Potts' conscientious work is without interest or value, unless it be such a catalogue as he gives us on p. 209 of all the persons and things to which Wordsworth applies the epithet 'meek.' One may think however that his source-hunting sometimes carries him too far. On p. 235 he is commenting on the last lines of

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Sonnet I, 27, where it is said that, protected by branches above from the tempest,

> gentle virtues thrive
> As oft, mid some green plot of open ground,
> Wide as the oak extends its dewy gloom
> The fostered hyacinths spread their purple bloom.

One would think that Wordsworth had seen a mass of bluebells growing under oak trees sufficiently often to need no poetical source for his simile. Mr Potts however considers that he is recalling some lines of Lady Winchelsea (which he quoted later in a letter in 1830):

> Love's soft bands,
> His *gentle* cords of *hyacinths* and roses,
> Wove in the *dewy* spring when *storms* are silent.

Could any two passages be more unlike?

G. C. M. S.

We welcome *The Poetical Works of Leigh Hunt*, edited by H. S. Milford (London: H. Milford. 1923. 8vo. lvi + 776 pp. 7*s*.), for it fills a gap of which students of early nineteenth-century literature have long been conscious. Since the edition of the poems issued by Leigh Hunt's son in 1860 only selections have appeared. The volume aims at giving the reader all that is worthy of consideration and certainly provides us with far more material for a proper estimate of Leigh Hunt than is elsewhere available in one volume. The inclusion of unpublished writings from various sources adds to the value of the book. The editor was specially fortunate in being able to use the MSS. of Mr T. J. Wise, most generous of collectors. Viewed in conjunction with the forthcoming Life of Hunt by Mr Edmund Blunden, this edition will show in his true position one who has been greatly maligned and misunderstood.

H. G. W.

In a small volume on *The Variations between the Original and Standard Editions of Balzac's 'Les Chouans'* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1923. viii + 71 pp. $1.25), Miss Helen E. Barnes gives the results of an intimate study of the differences between the original edition of *Les Chouans*—the first of Balzac's published works to bear his own signature—and the definitive edition of this work which includes the author's final corrections of 1846 as well as those dating from the years 1834 and 1836. The minute study of the 647 variations up to 'The First Attack' is a model of diligent and patient research. Miss Barnes set out with the object of securing specific information relative to Balzac's method of composition, his style and his Realism, and in the whole range of the *Comédie Humaine* she could hardly have chosen a work more characteristic of the author or more suited to her purpose than this one, of which the first and last versions are separated by a space of seventeen years.

From the study of the mechanical variations and the almost innumerable variations of word and phrase, the author of this monograph reveals the infinite pains of the novelist to perfect his story, his wonderful

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

command of the mother tongue, his wide range of vocabulary and fine appreciation of the subtle distinctions of language, despite the many blemishes which almost inevitably mar the work of so prolific a writer.

The question of 'animalisms' and even of 'vegetablisms' seems to be given undue importance in this study, but from the variations quoted the writer has admirably illustrated Balzac's Cooperesque intentions—including the use of 'reappearing' characters throughout the *Comédie Humaine*—the presence of certain Romantic elements in Balzac and the use he made of most, if not all, of the general elements of Realism.

Even his most favourable critics have given great prominence to Balzac's all too apparent slovenliness in style and composition, defects due more often than not to the financial exigencies of the moment and to his over-exuberant imagination, and Miss Barnes renders a signal service to the true appreciation of his writings by the justice she does to the real feeling for style evidenced by the variations in those of his works that he had time to revise.

B. N. P.

The treatise *Sintaxi Catalana segon los escrits en prosa de Bernat Metge* (1398), by Anfós Par (*Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, LXVI. Halle: M. Niemeyer. 1923. 8vo. x + 580 pp. 17 M.), discusses the *Schriftsprache* of the Chanceries of Juan I and Martin I of Catalonia, studied from the *Somni* (1398) and the translation of Petrarch's *Walter and Griselda* by Bernat Metge. That author's style is sufficiently distinguished, uniform, and free from dialectal peculiarities of all kinds, and, as he belongs to the best period of the language, this elaborate and scrupulous analysis is directed to those who have in hand the literary restoration of the Catalan speech. In this sense the *Sintaxi Catalana* has the advantage over other works of being documentary and not preceptual, though Metge, in his desire for uniformity, sometimes artificially limits his use of the resources of the language (e.g., in the formula of necessity, p. 290, in connecting two adverbs in *-ment*, p. 545, or in clauses of the type Fr. *de ce que*, Span. *de que*, *de si*, *de como*, p. 346).

The Romance linguist will be grateful for the perspicuous and careful paragraphing, which is designed so as to allow of immediate reference to Meyer-Lübke's *Grammaire des langues romanes*, together with the full indices of words and ideas. Without neglecting the scholarly edition of the *Somni* by En R. Miquel y Planas, the author bases his analysis directly on the manuscripts, on which he makes some textual remarks. Metge's poems are not included in this study because of their deflection into Provençal. The practice of Metge is set forth with the greatest parade of detail, with occasional references to the usages of other Romance languages or to Modern Barcelonese. There are commendably few historical discussions, and, so far as I am aware, no references to dialects (e.g., the Majorcan and Ampurdan article from *ipse*). This lies within the purpose of the author who intends this full statement of the *Schriftsprache* in the prose of one writer to serve as

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

the basis for horizontal and vertical studies of Catalan syntax, indicating certain lines which he himself intends to follow.

In sum, En Anfós Par's *Sintaxi Catalana* is a scrupulous, copious and authoritative exposition of his subject, and will find a place on the shelves of every student of Romance languages.

W. J. E.

A very readable little book by Matthew G. Bach discusses *Wieland's Attitude toward Woman and her Cultural and Social Relations* (New York: Columbia Univ. Press; London: H. Milford. 1922. 7*s*.). In chronological survey, with copious quotation from Wieland's writings and a knowledge of Wieland literature, the author develops the different phases through which the poet passed. The suprasensuous idealism of his seraphic youth culminated in passion for Julia Bondeli, two years his senior, unbeautiful, not a marrying type, but a brilliant and stimulating personality, whom Rousseau describes as having 'la raison d'un homme et l'esprit d'une femme, la plume de Voltaire, la tête de Leibnitz.' Thereupon followed the years of revulsion in Biberach when Wieland earned his reputation for cynical sensualism and 'naughtiness.' The mature Wieland, the valued preceptor of the young Karl August, has found his balance, is the advocate of 'reason,' moderation, self-restraint in passion as elsewhere. Throughout his works the poet shows himself a good friend of womanhood, possessed of a sense of its intrinsic value. Woman the worthy helpmeet of man receives inevitably the palm, but the helpmeet of Wieland's ideal imaginings differs from the gudewife who made him the well-cared-for and contented paterfamilias he was, in being both highly cultivated and intellectually well-endowed, capable of sharing to the full the larger life till then traditionally reserved to the male. We are accustomed to think of Wieland as being intensely of the eighteenth century, and so he was both in temperament and literary form. Yet so subtly do literary movements intertwine that the realization of Wieland's ideal of womanhood is found—in the Romantic movement—in Caroline and Dorothea.

One criticism we should like to make. The translation from the German is not always entirely felicitous or accurate. To give but one instance, 'Ich überliess mich der Einbildungskraft....Ich hatte Augenblicke, wo ich fühlte, ohne zu glauben' can be better rendered than by 'I resigned myself to powers of imagination. I had moments where I felt without belief.'

I. M. M.

Two recent books dealing with somewhat remote languages may fairly claim the interest of the comparative philologist. In the *Primitiae Linguae Vasconum—Einführung ins Baskische* (Halle: Niemeyer. 1923. 3 M.) the veteran Hugo Schuchardt, whose competence is attested by a long series of Basque publications ranging from loan-word studies and affinity investigations in the eighties and nineties to phonetic texts of single dialects (e.g. the Labourdin of Sara) in 1922, has supplied a long-

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

felt want. He has taken the parable of the Prodigal Son from Luke xv, 11 *et seq.* in the Leizarragan translation of 1571, eliminated gallicisms from the orthography, provided a word for word rendering in German of each line of the Basque text and given full and illuminating analyses of the Basque forms and meanings. His plan is eminently suited to the treatment of languages of peculiar syntactical structure and would have added to the practical value of such an introduction as Neuhaus, *Einführung ins Irische* (Halle, 1924).

The other work, Norbert Jokl's *Linguistisch-kulturhistorische Untersuchungen aus dem Bereiche des Albanischen* (Berlin and Leipzig: W. de Gruyter. 1923. 10 M.), bears out the good impression made by the author's admirable conspectus of Albanological studies published in Streitberg's *Handbuch*. Following the lead of Meringer and others Jokl links the study of words with that of the 'nominanda' themselves and is able to use his knowledge of Albanian culture (customs, methods of agriculture, pasturage, building, etc.) to excellent effect. Noteworthy attempts are here made—by the utilization of sound philological reasoning—to separate out the most venerable portions of the Indo-European inheritance from the mass of early and late accretions from the surrounding languages. The arduous nature of the task may be gauged from the fact that no connected Albanian text is traceable before the fifteenth century.

W. E. C.

The New Society of Letters in Lund (Vetenskaps-Societeten i Lund) begins in September the publication of an 'international critical review of the humanities,' under the title *Litteris*. The editors are S. B. Liljegren, Jöran Sahlgren and Lauritz Weibull. The journal is to fulfil a twofold purpose, to provide an organ in which Swedish scholarship will be surveyed in its relations to European scholarship in general, and to make known to the Swedish public the most important works published in other countries. It is to be in the fullest sense international, and the collaboration is invited of all countries and in all languages familiar to European scholars. English is the language adopted for editorial purposes, and, if necessary, contributions in languages other than English, French and German will be summarised in English by one of the editors. *Litteris* is to appear three times a year (in the first year twice), and the subscription is 8 kronor (first year, 5 kronor). The managing editor is S. B. Liljegren, Lund. Mr H. Milford, Oxford University Press, will be the publisher in this country.

Digitized by Google

Original from
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

March–May, 1924.

GENERAL.

AUDIAN, J., La Pastourelle dans la poésie occitane du moyen âge. Paris, Boccard. 7 fr. 50.

BAUGH, A. C. and others, American Bibliography for 1923 (*Publ. M. L. A. Amer.*, xxxix, 1, March).

BORINSKI, K., Die Antike in Poetik und Kunsttheorie. II. (Das Erbe der Alten, i, 10.) Leipzig, Dieterich. 14 M.

British Academy, Proceedings of the. 1919–20. London, H. Milford. 40*s*.

CUNY, A., Études prégrammaticales sur la domaine des langues indo-européennes et chamito-sémitiques. Paris, E. Champion. 50 fr.

FRANCE, A., On Life and Letters. Transl. by B. Miall. London, J. Lane. 7*s*. 6*d*.

GEMOLL, W., Das Apophthegma. Literarhistorische Studien. Vienna, Hölder-Pichler-Tempsky. 5 M. 60.

HATZFELD, H., Leitfaden der vergleichenden Bedeutungslehre. Munich, M. Hueber. 2 M. 50.

JOURDAIN, E. F., The Drama in Europe: its Theory and Practice. London, Methuen. 5*s*.

LILJEGREN, S. B., Romantiken och månen (*Vetenskaps-Soc. i Lund, Årsbok*, 1923).

MAHRHOLZ, W., Literargeschichte und Literarwissenschaft. Berlin, Mauritius-Verlag. 2 M. 50.

MANLY, J. M., The Outlook. Presidential Address (Publ. of the Mod. Humanities Research Association, vi). Cambridge, Bowes and Bowes. 1*s*.

SAHLGREN, J., Är mytosofien en vetenskap? (*Vetenskaps-Soc. i Lund, Årsbok*, 1923).

SIEVERS, E., Ziele und Wege der Schallanalyse. Zwei Vorträge. (German. Bibl. ii, 14.) Heidelberg, C. Winter. 1 M. 50.

SPARNAAY, H., Compositietechniek van den hoofschen roman. Groningen, P. Noordhoff. 60 c.

Stand und Aufgaben der Sprachwissenschaft. Festschrift für W. Streitberg. Heidelberg, C. Winter. 22 M.

THOMPSON, E. N. S., Literary Bypaths of the Renaissance. New Haven, Yale Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 14*s*.

VAN TIEGHEM, P., Les Idylles de Gessner et le rêve pastoral dans le pré-romantisme européen (*fin*) (*Rev. litt. comp.*, iv, 2).

WINKLER, E., Das dichterische Kunstwerk. Heidelberg, C. Winter. 2 M.

ROMANCE LANGUAGES.

Mediaeval Latin.

Gesta Romanorum, translated by C. Swan. With Introd. by E. A. Baker (Broadway Translations). London, G. Routledge. 12*s*. 6*d*.

LABRIOLLE, P. DE, Histoire de la littérature latine chrétienne. Paris, Belles Lettres. 25 fr.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Italian.

Asín Palacios, M., La escatología musulmana en 'La Divina Commedia' (*Bol. Acad. españ.*, xi, 51, 52, Feb.–April).

Asín Palacios, M., L'influence musulmane dans la 'Divine Comédie': Histoire et critique d'une polémique (*Rev. litt. comp.*, iv, 2, June).

Barbi, M., Il canto di Farinata (*Studi dant.*, viii).

Borgese, G. A., La vita e il libro. I. Bologna, N. Zanichelli. L. 28.

Calderoni, M., Scritti. 2 vols. Florence, 'La Voce.' L. 50.

Cantella, A., Calderón de la Barca in Italia nel sec. xvii. Rome, Ausonia. L. 5.

Casella, M., Studi sul testo della 'Divina Commedia' (*Studi dant.*, viii).

Cazzamini Mussi, F., Ritratti letterari. Palermo, Sandron. L. 10.

Cesareo, G. A., Le origini della poesia lirica e la poesia siciliana sotto gli Svevi. 2da ed. Palermo, Sandron. L. 18.

Charlier, G., Manzoni. Paris, Renaissance du Livre. 5 fr.

Cian, V., La Satira. I. Milan, Vallardi.

Croce, B., Shaftesbury in Italy. Presidential Address (Publ. Mod. Humanities Association, vii). Cambridge, Bowes and Bowes. 1*s.*

Da Dante al Manzoni. Studi critici offerti a G. A. Venturi. Pavia, Fusi.

Dante, La Divina Commedia. Testo critico a cura di M. Casella. Bologna, Zanichelli.

Di Francia, L. Novellistica, I. Dalle origini al Bandello. Milan, Vallardi.

Duchartre, P. A., La Comédie italienne. Paris, Libr. de France. 80 fr.

Evangelisti, A., G. Carducci col suo maestro e col suo precursore. Bologna, Cappelli. L. 18.

Ferrero, G. G., L'unità ideale della visione poetica carducciana (*Rev. d'Italia*, xxvii, 4).

Giusti, G., Tutti gli scritti editi ed inediti. A cura di F. Martini. Florence, Barbèra. L. 40.

Grandgent, C. H., Discourses on Dante. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. $2.25.

Guerrieri Crocetti, C., Il Rinaldo di T. Tasso. Florence, Vallecchi. L. 5.

Musella, V., Dante e la sua trilogia. Rome, Albrighi Segati. L. 10.

Orlandi, G., Intorno alla vita e alle opere di Pietro Andrea de' Bassi (*Giorn. stor. della lett. ital.*, lxxxiii, 1–2).

Pellizzari, A., Il Quadrivio nel Rinascimento. Naples, Perrella. L. 15.

Ricci, C., Cogliendo biada o loglio: Scritti danteschi. Florence, Le Monnier. L. 12.50.

Sabbadini, R., Giovanni da Ravenna insigne figura d'umanista (1343–1408). Como, Nani. L. 40.

Santi, A. L'ordinamento morale e l'allegoria della Divina Commedia. Palermo, Sandron. L. 16.

Smith, W., The Earl of Essex on the Stage (N. Biancolelli) (*Publ. M. L. A. Amer.*, xxxix, 1, March).

Solmi, E., Scritti vinciani. Florence, 'La Voce.'

Tasso, T., Aminta. Ed. with an Essay on Renaissance Pastoral Drama and Prose Translation by E. Grillo. London, E. Dent. 5*s.*

Thovez, E., Il filo di Arianna. Milan, 'Corbaccio.' L. 16.

Tilgher, A., Ricognizioni: Profili di scrittori e movimenti spirituali contemporanei italiani. Rome, Bardi. L. 10.

Tommaseo, N., Dizionario della lingua italiana. Ed. integra. Turin, Unione. L. 380.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

TROMPEO, P. P., Nell' Italia romantica sulle orme di Stendhal. Rome, Casa ed. Leonardo da Vinci. L. 25.

ZICCARDI, G., Le Fiabe di C. Gozzi, II (*Giorn. stor. della lett. ital.*, lxxiii, 1–2).

Spanish and Portuguese.

ALARCON, J. R. DE, La verdad sospechosa. Herausg. von A. Hämel. (Romanische Bücherei, ii.) Munich, M. Hueber. 1 M. 50.

BACCI, L., Letteratura spagnuola. Milan, Vallardi. L. 50.

BELL, A. F. G., Diego do Conto (Hispanic Notes and Monographs. Portuguese Series, vi). London, H. Milford. 4*s*.

DOMÍNGUEZ BORDONA, J., La primera parte de la 'Crónica de conquiridores' de F. de Heredia (*Rev. fil. espaň.*, x, 4).

FICHTER, W. L., Notes on the Chronology of Lope de Vega's Comedias (*Mod. Lang. Notes*, xxxix, 5, May).

GUERLIN, H., L'Espagne moderne vue par ses écrivains. Paris, Perrin. 7 fr.

LE GENTIL, G., Camoens. Paris, Renaissance du Livre. 5 fr.

MARTIN, H. M., Lope de Vega's 'El vellocino de Oro' in relation to its sources (*Mod. Lang. Notes*, xxxix, 3, March).

MENÉNDEZ PIDAL, R., Relatos poéticos en las crónicas medievales (*Rev. fil. espaň.*, x, 4).

MENÉNDEZ PIDAL, R., El réy Rodrigo en la literatura (*Bol. Acad. Espaň.*, xi, 52, April).

SARALEGUI, M. DE, Escarceos filológicos (*Bol. Acad. Espaň.*, xi, 51, 52, April).

French.

(*a*) *General* (*incl. Linguistic*).

BEHRENS, D., Über deutsches Sprachgut im Französischen (Giessener Beitr. zur roman. Phil., Zusatzhefte, i). Giessen, Roman. Seminar. 3 M.

BRUNOT, F., Histoire de la langue française. IV, 2. (La Langue classique, 1660–1715.) Paris, Colin. 40 fr.

CLÉDAT, L., En marge des grammaires. II. Remarques sur les compléments. III. Les démonstratifs (*Rev. phil. franç.*, xxxvi, 1).

FALK, HJ., La philosophie linguistique française (*Vetenskaps-Soc. i Lund, Årsbok*, 1923).

HATZFELD, H., Über Bedeutungsverschiebung durch Formähnlichkeit im Neufranzösischen. Eine semasiologisch-lexikographische Studie. Munich, M. Hueber. 7 M. 50.

LESCALE, P., Recherches et observations sur le patois du Quercy. Paris, E. Champion. 6 fr.

SCOTT, J. B., Le français, langue diplomatique moderne. Avec Introduction de N. M. Butler. Paris, Pedone.

SPITZER, L., Nochmals franz. 'biffe'; schweizerfranz. 'jaffer' (*Neuphil. Mitteil.*, xxv, 1, 2).

(*b*) *Old French.*

BROOKS, N. C., Notes on performances of French Mystery Plays (*Mod. Lang. Notes*, xxxix, 5, May).

CHARTIER, ALAIN, Le Quadrilogue invectif, éd. par E. Droz (Classiques français du moyen âge). Paris, E. Champion. 4 fr.

FARAL, E., Les arts poétiques du 12e et du 13e siècle (Bibl. de l'École des hautes études, Fasc. 238). Paris, E. Champion. 42 fr.

JEANROY, A., Le Théâtre religieux en France du 11e au 13e siècle. Paris, Boccard. 5 fr.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

KRAPPE, A. H., The Cantar de los Infantes de Lara and the Chanson de Roland (*Neuphil. Mitteil.*, XXV, 1, 2).

Queste del Saint Graal, La. Roman du XIII^e^ siècle, éd. par A. Pauphilet (Classiques français du moyen âge). Paris, E. Champion. 14 fr.

(*c*) ***Modern French.***

ALLARD, L., La comédie de mœurs en France au 19^e^ siècle. I. De Picard à Scribe, 1795–1815. Paris, Hachette. 12 fr.

ARRIGON, L. J., Les débuts littéraires d'Honoré de Balzac. Paris, Perrin. 7 fr.

BAUMAL, F., Molière auteur précieux. Paris, Renaissance du Livre. 4 fr.

BELLESSORT, A., Balzac (*Rev. hebdom.*, Feb. 16–April 19).

BELLESSORT, A., Nouvelles études et autres figures. Paris, Bloud. 10 fr.

BERSAUCOURT, A. DE, E. Verhaeren. Sa vie, son œuvre. Paris, Nouv. Revue critique. 4 fr. 50.

CAUCHIÉ, M., Documents pour servir à l'histoire littéraire du 17^e^ siècle. Paris, E. Champion. 12 fr.

COHEN, G., Ronsard, sa vie, son œuvre. Paris, Boivin. 12 fr.

CROSBY, E. A., Une romancière oubliée: Mme Riccoboni. Paris, Rieder. 12 fr.

DU PLESSYS, M., Le feu sacré. Poèmes. Préface d'E. Raynaud. Paris, Garnier.

ESTÈVE, E., Études de littérature préromantique. Paris, E. Champion. (Bibl. de la Revue de litt. comp., v.)

ESTÈVE, E., Sully Prudhomme, poète sentimentale et poète philosophe (*Rev. des cours et conf.*, March 15, April 15).

EVANS, D. O., Les problèmes d'actualité au théâtre à l'époque romantique. 1827–50. Paris, La Vie universitaire. 12 fr.

FAURE, G., J. J. Rousseau en Dauphiné, 1768–1770. Grenoble, Allier. 10 fr.

GOURMONT, R. DE, Pensées inédites. Paris, E. Champion. 100 fr.

HALLAYS, A., Ch. Perrault (*Rev. hebd.*, April 5, 12).

HANKISS, J., Essai sur la farce (*Rev. phil. franç.*, XXXVI, 1).

HAZARD, P., Manon Lescaut, roman janséniste (*Rev. d. d. Mondes*, April 1).

HERMAND, P., Les idées morales de Diderot. Paris, Presses univ.

LAFORGUE, J., Œuvres. III. Paris, Mercure de France. 15 fr.

LALOU, R., Histoire de la littérature contemporaine: 1870 à nos jours. Réimpression. Paris, Crès. 12 fr.

LANSON, G., La vie morale selon les essais de Montaigne, II (*Rev. d. d. Mondes*, Feb. 15).

LIEBNECHT, Histoire du théâtre français à Bruxelles au 17^e^ et au 18^e^ siècle (Bibl. de la Revue de litt. comp., XI). Paris, E. Champion. 60 fr.

MAY, J. L. Anatole France. The Man and his Work. London, J. Lane. 15*s*.

MENOT, M., Sermons choisis. Éd. par J. Nève. (Publ. du 15^e^ siècle.) Paris, E. Champion. 50 fr.

MICHELET, J., et A. MICKIEWICZ, Lettres intimes (*Rev. d. d. Mondes*, Mar. 1).

MIGNON, M., Études sur le théâtre français et italien de la Renaissance. Paris, E. Champion.

MORICE, H., Jules Lemaître. Paris, Perrin. 7 fr.

PAILLERON, M. L., Les écrivains du Second Empire. Paris, Perrin. 12 fr.

PÉREIRE, A., Le Journal des débats politiques et littéraires, 1814–1914. Paris, E. Champion. 50 fr.

PLATTARD, J., L'Adolescence de Rabelais en Poitou. Paris, Les Belles Lettres. 10 fr.

POIZAT, A., Le Symbolisme. Paris, Bloud. 10 fr.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

PROAL, L., La Psychologie de J. J. Rousseau. Paris, Alcan. 20 fr.

RONSARD, P., Poésies choisies. Recueillies sur un plan nouveau et annotées par P. de Nolhac. Paris, Garnier. 7 fr. 50.

RUCHON, F., Jules Laforgue, 1860–87. Sa vie et son œuvre. Paris, Agence générale de librairie. 30 fr.

SCHERMERHORN, E. W., Benjamin Constant. Préface by F. Baldensperger. London, Heinemann. 21*s*.

VALERI, D., Poeti francesi del nostro tempo. Milan, Porta. L. 5.

WICKELGREN, F. L., La Pensée de la Mothe le Vayer (*French Quart.*, v, 4, Dec.).

WILSON, C. I., Paul Valéry (*French Quart.*, v, 4, Dec.).

GERMANIC LANGUAGES.

HEUSLER, A., Die altgermanische Dichtung. Heft 1, 2. (Handbuch der Literaturwissenschaft, 11, 12.) Potsdam, Athenaion. Each 2 M. 20.

Jahresbericht über die Erscheinungen auf dem Gebiete der germanischen Philologie. Neue Folge, I. Berlin, De Gruyter. 9 M.

Scandinavian.

ALMQUIST, C. J. L., Samlade skrifter, utg. av F. Böök. XXIX. Stockholm, Bonnier. 5 kr. 75.

BLICHER, S. S., Samlede skrifter. XII. Udg. af J. Aakjær og G. Christensen. Copenhagen, Gyldendal. 6 kr. 75.

BOOR, H. DE, Schwedische Literatur. Breslau, F. Hirt. 2 M. 50.

FRIIS, O., Outlines of Danish Poetry from Oehlenschläger to J. V. Jensen (*Edda*, XXI, 4).

Hávarðar Saga Ísfirðings. Udg. for Samfund til Udgivelse af gammel nordisk Litteratur ved B. K. Þórólfsson. Copenhagen, Gyldendal. 6 kr.

Heiðreks Saga. Hervarar Saga ok Heiðreks Konungs. Udg. for Samfund til Udgivelse af gammel nordisk Litteratur ved J. Helgason. I. Copenhagen, Gyldendal. 3 kr. 50.

HIPPEL, O., Studier till predikans historia under nyromantiken. I. Stockholm, Åhlen och Åkerlund. 5 kr. 50.

HOST, S., Henrik Ibsen. Paris, Delamain. 7 fr.

KOCK, A., Svensk ljudhistoria. V, 1. Lund, C. W. K. Gleerup. 4 kr. 50.

KROGH, T., Zur Geschichte des dänischen Singspiels im 18. Jahrhundert. Copenhagen, Levin og Minksgaard. 8 kr.

MARTENSEN-LARSEN, H., Den virkelige Fr. Paludan-Müller. Copenhagen, Frimodt. 3 kr. 75.

NYSTRØM, E., Skuespiltekster fra Komediehuset i Lille Grønnegade. V. Copenhagen, Gyldendal. 15 kr.

Nysvenska studier. Tidskrift för svensk stil och språkforskning. Utg. av B. Hesselman och O. Östergren. Uppsala, Appelberg. Årg. 8 kr.

PETERSEN, C. S., Holberg i Sorøegnen. Foredrag. Copenhagen, H. Aschehoug. 1 kr. 50.

PIPPING, H., Studier i nordisk filologi. XIV. (Skrifter utg. av Svensk Litteratursälskapet i Finland.)

ROSENBERG, C. M., Studier over Oehlenschlägers Hakon Jarl (Studier fra Sprog- og Oldtidsforskning, CXXX). Copenhagen, Pio. 2 kr. 75.

SÖDERHJELM, W., Skrifter. Stockholm, A. Bonnier. III, IV. Each 4 kr. 75.

Sǫgur Danakonunga. I. Sǫgubrot af Forkonungum. II. Knytlinga Saga. Udg. för Samfund til Udgivelse af gammel nordisk Litteratur. Copenhagen, Gyldendal. 3 kr. 50.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

SOLSTRAND, V., Finlands svenska folkdiktning. III. Ordstäv. (Skrifter utg. av Svensk Litteratursälskapet i Finland.) 40 kr.

STRINDBERG, A., Werke. Deutsche Gesamtausgabe. Briefe an E. Schering. Munich, G. Müller. 6 M.

English.

(*a*) *General* (*incl. Linguistic*).

Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association. IX. Collected by the late W. P. Ker. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 7*s.* 6*d.*

FLASDIECK, H., Ein südost-mittelenglischer Lautwandel (*Engl. Stud.*, lviii, 1).

FLOM, G. T., Place-Name Test of Racial Mixture in Northern England (*Mod. Lang. Notes*, xxxix, 4, April).

GREW, S., A Book of English Prosody. London, Grant Richards. 6*s.*

Studies in English by Members of the English Seminar of the Charles University of Prague. I. Prague, F. Rivnáče. 12 Kč.

(*b*) *Old and Middle English.*

CURRY, W. C., Chauntecleer and Pertelote on Dreams (*Engl. Stud.*, lviii, 1).

FARNHAM, W., England's Discovery of the 'Decameron' (*Publ. M. L. A. Amer.*, xxxix, 1, March).

KUHL, E. P., Chaucer and Aldgate (*Publ. M. L. A. Amer.*, xxxix, 1, March).

LANDRUM, G. W., Chaucer's Use of the Vulgate (*Publ. M. L. A. Amer.*, xxxix, 1, March).

MAXFIELD, E. K., Chaucer and Religious Reform (*Publ. M. L. A. Amer.*, xxxix, 1, March).

PECOCK, R., The Folewer to the Donet. Ed. by E. V. Hitchcock. (Early Engl. Text Society, Orig. Series, No. 164.) London, H. Milford. 30*s.*

PIEPER, W., Das 'Parlament' in der mittelengl. Literatur (*Archiv f. neu. Spr.*, cxlvi, 3–4).

ROOT, R. K., and H. N. RUSSELL, A Planetary Date for Chaucer's 'Troilus' (*Publ. M. L. A. Amer.*, xxxix, 1, March).

SYDOW, C. W. VON, Beowulfskalden och nordisk tradition (*Vetenskaps-Soc. i Lund, Årsbok*, 1923).

WELLS, W. H., Chaucer as a Literary Critic (*Mod. Lang. Notes*, xxxix, 5, May).

(*c*) *Modern English.*

ARCHER, W., Elizabethan Stage and Restoration Drama (*Quart. Rev.*, April).

BENSUSAN, S. L., The Bee in Literature (*Quart. Rev.*, April).

BORROW, G., Works. Norwich Edition. Ed. by C. Shorter. 16 vols. London, Constable. £15. 15*s.*

CARLYLE, JANE W., Letters to her Family, 1839–63. Ed. by L. Huxley. London, J. Murray. 21*s.*

CHASE, S. P., Hazlitt as a Critic of Art (*Publ. M. L. A. Amer.*, xxxix, 1, March).

CHELLI, M., Le Drame de Massinger. Paris, Les Belles Lettres. 25 fr.

CHEW, S. C., Byron in England: His Fame and After Fame. London, J. Murray. 21*s.*

CLARK, H. H., A Study of Melancholy in E. Young (*Mod. Lang. Notes*, xxxix, 3, March).

DELATTRE, F., Dickens. Paris, Renaissance du Livre. 5 fr.

DELATTRE, F., William James bergsonien. Paris, Presses universitaires.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

DRINKWATER, J., Robert Burns. An Address. Edinburgh, Univ. Press.

ERNLE, LORD, The Poetry of Byron (*Quart. Rev.*, April).

ESTÈVE, E., Byron. Paris, Renaissance du Livre. 5 fr.

FORREST, H. T. S., The Five Authors of 'Shake-speare's Sonnets.' London, Chapman and Dodd. 30*s.*

FÖRSTER, M., Zum Jubiläum der Shakespeare-Folio (*Zeitschr. f. Bücherfreunde*, xvi, 3).

GOSSE, E., A Short History of Modern English Literature. New ed. London, Heinemann. 8*s.* 6*d.*

GREENE, G. S., A New Date for G. Wilkins's 'Three Miseries of Barbary' (*Mod. Lang. Notes*, xxxix, 5, May).

HARVITT, H., How Henry James revised 'Roderick Hudson' (*Publ. M. L. A. Amer.*, xxxix, 1, March).

KAYE, F. B., Mandeville on the Origin of Language (*Mod. Lang. Notes*, xxxix, 3, March).

KRAPPE, A. H., A Byzantine Source of Shakespeare's 'Othello' (*Mod. Lang. Notes*, xxxix, 3, March).

LAW, A., Patrick Branwell Brontë. London, A. M. Philpot. 6*s.*

MÉGROZ, R. L., Walter de la Mare. A Biographical and Critical Study. London, Hodder and Stoughton. 7*s.* 6*d.*

MESSINESE, G., Il 'Macbeth' di Shakespeare. Lodi, Tip. Biancardi. L. 6.

NICOLSON, H., Byron: the Last Journey, April 1823–April 1824. London, Constable. 12*s.* 6*d.*

PARTRIDGE, E., Eighteenth Century English Romantic Poetry up till the Publication of the Lyrical Ballads. Paris, E. Champion. 25 fr.

RICHTER, H., Thomas De Quincey (*Engl. Stud.*, lviii, 1).

RITCHIE, A. T., Letters. With Forty-two additional Letters from her Father, W. M. Thackeray. Ed. by H. Ritchie. London, J. Murray. 15*s.*

ROBINSON, C., and divers others. A Handful of Pleasant Delights (1584). Ed. by H. E. Rollins. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 15*s.*

SCHIRMER, W. F., Renaissance und Puritanismus. Eine Studie zur englischen Literaturgeschichte des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts. Munich, M. Hueber. 7 M. 50.

SECORD, A. W., Studies in the Narrative Method of Defoe (Univ. of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, ix, 1). Urbana, Univ. of Illinois Press. $1.50.

SEIBEL, G., The Religion of Shakespeare. London, Watts. 2*s.* 6*d.*

SHANKS, E., Bernard Shaw. (Writers of the Day.) London, Nisbet. 2*s.*

SPENDER, H., Byron and Greece. London, J. Murray. 15*s.*

SYMON, J. D., Byron in Perspective. London, M. Secker. 12*s.* 6*d.*

SYMONS, A., Collected Works. 16 vols. London, M. Secker. 12*s.*

TABLEY, LORD DE, Select Poems. Ed. by J. Drinkwater. London, H. Milford. 3*s.* 6*d.*

German.

(*a*) *General* (*incl. Linguistic*).

RAHN, D., Die Orts- und Flurnamen des Stadt- und Landkreises Greifswald. Greifswald, J. Abel.

WELLANDER, E., Studien zum Bedeutungswandel im Deutschland. II. Uppsala, Lundequist. 6 kr. (Uppsala Univ. Årsskrift, 1923.)

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

(*b*) *Old and Middle High German.*

BALDINGER, E., Der Minnesinger Graf Rudolf von Fenis-Neuenburg. Bern, A. Francke. 7 fr.

DAM, J. VAN, Das Veldeke-Problem. Groningen, J. B. Wolters. 75 c.

EILHART VON OBERG, Tristrant. Herausg. von K. Wagner. I. (Rheinische Beiträge und Hülfsbücher zur german. Phil. und Volkskunde, v.) 5 M.

WOLFF, L., Der Gottfried von Strassburg zugeschriebene Marienpreis und Lobgesang auf Christus (Jenaer germ. Forschungen, iv). Jena, Frommann. 6 M.

(*c*) *Modern German.*

ALFERO, G. A., A. von Chamisso. Turin, Bocca. L. 20.

ANGELUS SILESIUS (Joh. Scheffler), Sämtliche poetische Werke. Herausg. von G. Ellinger. 2 vols. Berlin, Propyläen-Verlag. 17 M.

Chronik des Wiener Goethe-Vereins, xxxiv. Vienna, Amalthea-Verlag.

CYSARZ, H., Deutsche Barockdichtung. Leipzig, H. Haessel. 10 M.

DAUMER, G. F., Gesammelte poetische Werke. Herausg. von L. Hirschberg. I. Berlin, Trowitsch. 8 M.

Deutsche Klassiker in Form und Text ihrer Erstausgaben. Goethe, Gedichte I, II (1815); Iphigenie auf Tauris (1787); Schiller, Wilhelm Tell (1804). Berlin, Morawe und Scheffelt. Each 2 M. 50.

ERDMANN, V., Hölderlins ästhetische Theorie im Zusammenhang seiner Weltanschauung (Jenaer german. Forschungen, ii). Jena, Frommann. 3 M.

FORSTREUTER, K., Die deutsche Ich-Erzählung (German. Studien, xxxiii). Berlin, E. Ebering. 3 M. 60.

GOETHE, J. W. VON, Faust. Kritisch durchgesehen, eingeleitet und erläutert von R. Petsch. Leipzig, Bibl. Institut. 6 M.

GRIEBEL, E., H. Löns, der niederdeutsche Dichter und Wanderer. Berlin, Naturschutz-Verlag. 3 M. 60.

Grillparzer-Gesellschaft, Jahrbuch der. XXVII. Vienna, Amalthea-Verlag.

HEISE, K., Parsifal: R. Wagners Festspiel in okkultisch-esoterischer Beleuchtung. Berlin, Linser Verlag. 4 M.

HOFMANNSTHAL, H. VON, Gesammelte Werke. I, 1–3. Berlin, S. Fischer. 20 M.

HORN, W., Über das Komische im Schauerroman: Hoffmanns 'Elixiere des Teufels' und ihre Beziehungen zur englischen Literatur (*Archiv f. neu. Spr.*, cxlvi, 3–4).

Jahresbericht über die wissenschaftlichen Erscheinungen auf dem Gebiete der neueren deutschen Literatur. I. Berlin, De Gruyter. 8 M.

Kleist-Gesellschaft, Jahrbuch der. Herausg. von G. Minde-Pouet und J. Petersen. Berlin, Weidmann. 10 M.

KOSSMANN, E. F., Die siebenzeilige Strophe in der deutschen Literatur. The Hague, M. Nijhoff. 3 fl.

LESSING, G. E., Gespräche nebst sonstige Zeugnisse aus seinem Umgang. Herausg. von F. von Biedermann. Berlin, Propyläen-Verlag. 8 M. 50.

LESSING, G. E., Sämtliche Schriften. Herausg. von K. Lachmann und F. Muncker. XXIII (Register). Berlin, De Gruyter. 16 M.

LICHTENBERG, G. C., Werke. Herausg. von R. K. Goldschmit. Stuttgart, W. Hädecke. 7 M.

LUTHER, M., Werke. Kritische Gesamtausgabe. Die deutsche Bibel, IV. Weimar, H. Böhlau.

MENSI, E., Il 'Filippo' dell' Alfieri e il 'Don Carlos' dello Schiller. Florence, Bemporad. L. 5.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Muschg, W., Kleist. Zürich, K. Hönn. 7 M.

Raimund, F., Sämtliche Werke. Historisch-kritische Ausgabe in 6 Bänden. Herausg. von E. Castle und F. Brukner. VI. Vienna, A. Schroll. 14 M.

Rehm, W., Das Werden des Renaissancebildes in der deutschen Dichtung vom Rationalismus bis zum Realismus. Munich, C. H. Beck. 5 M.

Riess, G., Die beiden Fassungen von Goethes 'Die Leiden des jungen Werthers.' Eine stilpsychologische Untersuchung. Breslau, Trewendt und Granier. 1 M.

Rose, W., From Goethe to Byron: The Development of 'Weltschmerz' in German Literature from Werther to the Beginning of the Romantic Movement. London, G. Routledge. 7*s.* 6*d.*

Russo, W., Goethes Faust auf den Berliner Bühnen (German. Studien, xxxii). Berlin, E. Ebering. 5 M. 65.

Storm, G., Wie mein Vater Immensee erlebte. Vienna, Hölder-Pichler-Tempsky. 1 M. 60.

Thomésr, I. A., Romantik und Neoromantik mit besonderer Berücksichtigung Hugo von Hofmannsthals. The Hague, M. Nijhoff. 4 fl.

Wiessner, H., Der Stabreimvers in R. Wagners Ring des Nibelungen (German. Stud., xxx). Berlin, E. Ebering. 3 M. 60.

Digitized by Google

Original from
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

VOLUME [illegible] OCTOBER, 1924 NUMBER 4

d (301–3'
' the c
ere

THE STYLE OF 'THE BATTLE OF MALDON.'

DURING the four or five hundred years when Old English poetry was being produced, some development must necessarily have taken place in the style of poetic composition. In the comprehensive view usually taken of the period, the distant perspective causes shades of difference to be lost and preserves only the bolder features, the strong family likeness, of works like *Wīdsīð* and *Beowulf* on the one hand and the poems of the tenth and eleventh centuries on the other. In the following paragraphs an attempt has been made to trace some of the developments which occurred between the two extremes and to bring minor differences into relief by analysing the style of the only one of the later poems of any length, and by comparing the elements with corresponding ones in representative early poems. To accomplish this, the subject has been treated under the main heads of variation, expression, amplification, vocabulary, and syntax.

Variation whether of subject-matter, expression, or terms was one of the most important features of Old English poetic style. To the modern ear its effects may often seem harmful to the unity of action and to the development of the narrative, but in its own day, when the recitation of poems was accompanied by the harp, these effects were probably considered no more out of place than the refrain of a modern song seems to a modern audience. Besides, it had its special uses, among which reminder, emphasis, and avoidance of monotony were the chief. In a poem as short as *Maldon* must have been, there was naturally no need for reminder, but emphasis and avoidance of monotony played an important part in the variation of subject-matter. The former accounts for the presence of the second of the following two passages:

Hī bugon þā fram beaduwe þe þǣr bēon noldon;
þǣr wurdon Oddan bearn ǣrest on flēame:
Godrīc fram gūþe, ond þone gōdan forlēt
þe him mænigne oft mēar gesealde;
hē gehlēop þone eoh, þe āhte his hlāford,
on þām gerædum, þe hit riht ne wæs;
ond his brōðru mid him bēgen ærndon,
Godwine ond Godwīg, gūþe ne gȳmdon
ac wendon fram þām wīge ond þone wudu sōhton,
flugon on þæt fæsten ond hyra fēore burgon,
ond manna mā þonne hit ænig mæð wǣre,
gif hī þā geearnunga ealle gemundon,

Digitized by Google Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

þe hē him tō duguðe gedōn hæfde.
Swā him Offa on dæg ǣr āsǣde
on þām meþelstede, þā hē gemōt hæfde, þahe in '
þæt þǣr mōdelīce manega sprǣcon A. S
þe eft æt þǣre þearfe þolian noldon. (ll. 185–201.)

Ūs Godrīc hæfð,
earh Oddan bearn, ealle beswicene ;
wēnde þæs for moni man, þā hē on mēare rād,
on wlancan þām wicge, þæt wære hit ūre hlāford ;
forþan wearð hēr on felda folc tōtwǣmed,
scyldburh tōbrocen. Ābrēoðe his angin,
þæt hē hēr swā manigne man āflȳmde. (ll. 237–243.)

The latter passage is no mere repetition, but a comment on the facts related by the former. The narrative does not therefore go into details, but gives a condensed general view of the incident, with an additional comment on its fatal character. Again, in the opening lines of the fragment the ealdorman's resolution of purpose is emphasised by the repetition in varied words of his determination to tolerate no slackness. In dealing with the deeds of warriors who fought well the poet has adopted the primitive device of relating the story of a series of single combats. It is here that his skill in variation is seen at its best. He was faced with putting into the mouths of his heroes speeches which were identical in intention, breathing forth the spirit which animated all but the cowards who fled, a task which by itself required much skill. But there was the additional complication of the restriction in detail through the necessity for introducing and emphasising in almost every speech certain Germanic conventions: the shame of surviving an unavenged victory, and the fear of taunts if the convention was broken. In spite of these difficulties, the poet has acquitted himself excellently of his task. The passages are six in number: Ælfwine (ll. 212–224), Offa (ll. 231–243), Leofsunu (ll. 246–253), Dunnere (ll. 258–9), Byrhtwold (ll. 312–319), and Ēadweard *se langa* (ll. 273–276; reported). Furthermore, in some cases the poet comments on the deeds of the heroes, a matter which entailed the risk of monotony, but which has been skilfully handled by means of variation. The cases are: Odda's sons (ll. 198–201), Ælfwine (ll. 225–229), Leofsunu (ll. 253–4), and Offa (288–294). Both speeches and comments have led to a kind of stanzaic arrangement of the second part of the poem, narrative being resumed in the intervals by a few lines of reference to the *mêlée*. In these narrative passages the love of variation is also seen, even though each passage clearly refers to a different stage of the fight. Thus, the beginning of the fight (108–112), the *mêlée* (122–126), the resolution of the fyrd after Byrhtnōð's death (202–208), the same repeated (260–264), the continuance of the battle (295–297), the same

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

repeated (301–303). Another skilful piece of variation to avoid monotony occurs in the call to the fyrd of Offa's kinsman and Ēadrīc (5–10 and 11–16). There the stanzaic arrangement is also seen, and the variation, with slight differences of detail, is very striking.

More striking still are the variations in the expression of one idea in the same sentence. These are the parallelisms so well known to students of Old English. They fall into two chief classes: the appositional and the sentence parallel. The former consists of two or more substantives in apposition to each other. Either substantive may be accompanied by an adjective or other qualifying expression. This class may again be subdivided into four sub-classes: the single, the compound, the complex, and the complex-complex parallelism. The single parallelism is very common and occurs in every kind of poetic form, except graphic descriptions of battles and other scenes of rapid action where short, abrupt sentences are used. It forms the basis on which the other sub-classes are constructed and into which they may all be resolved. Hence, it is the sub-class in which the parallelism may best be studied in detail. There are six species, the first five of which are substantival, the last verbal.

(i) Substantival: (*a*) the simple parallelism, in which the second substantive has no additional meaning, but is used for mere stylistic effect. There are nine examples in *Maldon*, occurring at ll. 11–12, 72–73, 108–9, 149–50, 152–3, 202–3, 213–4, 244–5, 321–2. E.g. *Ēac him wolde Ēadrīc* his ealdre *gelǣstan*, / frēan *tō gefeohte* (11–12); *Forlēt þā drenga sum daroð* of handa / *flēogan*, of folman (149–150).

(*b*) The explanatory parallelism, in which the second part expands the meaning of the first. E.g. *Ūs sceal* ord ond ecg *ǣr gesēman*, / grim gūðplega, *ǣr wē gafol syllon* (60–61); *Ūs* Godrīc *hæfð*, / earh Oddan bearn, *ealle beswicene* (237–8). The following instances also occur: 218 9, 228–9, 239–40, 252–3, 261–2, 266–7, 320–1.

(*c*) The introductory parallelism, in which a plural noun is followed by a list detailing the individuals referred to collectively by the first substantive. The second part always consists of personal names in *Maldon*. E.g. *Ond* his brōðru *mid him bēgen ærndon*, / Godwine ond Godwīg (191–2); *Ðær stōdon mid Wulfstāne* wigan unforhte, / Ælfere ond Maccus (79–80). There are two more examples: ll. 182–3, 186–7.

(*d*) The adjectival parallelism, in which one part consists of an adjective used as a noun. It is sometimes difficult to decide whether the adjective is used substantivally or merely attributively separated from its noun. Two instances occur in *Maldon*, namely: *Hēr līð* ūre

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

ealdor *eall forhēawen,* / gōd *on grēote* (314–5); *Hē lēt him þā of handon* lēofne *flēogan,* / hafoc *wið þæs holtes* (7–8).

(*e*) The emphatic parallelism, in which the first part is a pronoun used as a temporary grammatical subject, while the logical subject is held up till the end of the sentence. In the early poems like *Beowulf* this species is used with great effect for rounding off lengthy periods. Three instances occur in *Maldon*, none of which are very good examples of the species: Hī *þǣr Pantan strēam mid prasse bestōdon,* / Eastseaxena ord ond se æschere (68–69); *Đā* hī *þæt ongēaton ond georne gesāwon,* / *þæt hī þǣr bricgweardas bitere fundon,* / *ongunnon lytegian þā* lāþe gystas (84–86); *Hogodon georne* / *hwā þǣr mid orde ǣrost mihte* / *on fǣgean men feorh gewinnan,* / wigan mid wǣpnum (123–126). In the last example the temporary pronoun-subject has been omitted. With these may be compared the following short examples from *Beowulf*: Hē *þā frætwe wæg,* / *eorclanstānas, ofer ȳþa ful,* / rīce þēoden (*B.* 1207–9); *Đā* hē *hēan gewāt,* / *drēame bedǣled dēað-wīc sēon,* / mancynnes fēond (*B.* 1274–6).

(ii) Verbal: parallelisms between the substantival forms of verbs are rare. The type may be illustrated by an example from *Beowulf*: *Cearu wæs* geniwod, / geworden *in wīcum* (*B.* 1303–4). In *Maldon* the only instances which occur are *habban ond healdan* (237) and *hēow ond hȳnde* (324), phrases which do not properly come under the head of parallelisms.

Compound, complex, and complex-complex parallelisms are composed of two or more single parallelisms and present the same varieties of type. In the earlier poems they are used in descriptive passages, and some remarkably intricate examples occur in *Beowulf* and *Exodus*. But the *Maldon*-poet did not use them for this purpose, nor are his periods in which they occur, very complicated. Compound parallelisms consist of sentences which contain more than one word or phrase in apposition to the same substantive. Thus, *Wund wearð* Wulfmǣr, *wælræste gecēas,* / Byrhtnōðes mǣg, *hē mid billum wearð,* / his swustersunu, *swīþe forhēawen* (113–115); *Him be healfe stōd* hyse unweaxen, / cniht on gecampe, *sē full cāflīce* / *brǣd of þām beorne blōdigne gār,* / Wulfstānes bearn, Wulfmǣr se geonga (152–155).

Complex parallelisms comprise two or more different parallelisms closely connected syntactically in one sentence. These are less frequent than the compounds as a rule, but in *Maldon* two instances of each occur. *Ūs is eallum ðearf* / *þæt ūre æghwylc* ōþerne *bylde,* / wigan *tō wīge, þā hwīle þe hē* wǣpan *mæge* / *habban ond healdan,* heardne mēce, / gār

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

ond gōd swurd (233–237). Here the second parallelism is compound. Ōswald ond Ealdwold *ealle hwīle,* / bēgen þā gebrōþru, beornas *trymedon,* / hyra winemāgas *wordon bǣdon,* / *þæt,* etc. (304–306).

In some cases parallelisms overlap. These may be called complex-complex. They tend to obscure the meaning of the passage, and this danger becomes very great when a series of three or four overlapping parallelisms occur. An illustration of this occurs in *Maldon* (96–99): *Wōdon þā* wælwulfas, *for wætere ne murnon,* / wīcinga werod, west ofer Pantan, / ofer scīr wæter, scyldas wēgon, / lidmen *tō lande,* linde bǣron, where the diversity of punctuation and of translation in published editions demonstrates the difficulty of arriving at the exact sense. The other instance presents no such difficulty, however: *Hēr stynt unforcūð eorl mid his werode,* / *þe wile gealgean* ēþel þysne, / Æþelrēdes eard, ealdres mīnes, / folc ond foldan (51–54).

The second main division of the parallelism, the sentence parallel, consists of the variation of a complete syntactical unit. Sometimes the meaning of the second part is the same as that of the first; at other times it is slightly modified, becoming at times even antithetic. In the following instances there is no difference in meaning between the two parts: Wīcinga werod...scyldas wēgon, / lidmen tō lande, linde bǣron (97–99); Beornas fēollon / *on gehwæþere hand,* hyssas lāgon (111–112). But in others there is a slight difference in meaning, either through the addition of a qualifying word, as in: *Đā stōd on stæþe,* stīþlīce clypode, / *wīcinga ār,* wordum mǣlde (25–26); Đā hī þæt ongēaton *ond* georne gesāwon, etc. (84); *Wēnde þæs for moni man,* þā hē on mēare rād, / on wlancan þām wicge, *þæt wǣre hit ūre hlāford* (239–240); Wīgend cruncon / wundum wērige; wæl fēol on eorþan (302–3); or through a difference in a qualifying word or words, as in: *Hē lihte þā mid lēodon* þǣr him lēofost wæs, / þǣr hē his heorðwerod holdost wiste (23–24); *Oþþe* on here cringan, / on wælstōwe wundum sweltan (292–3); *Ic hlāfordlēas* hām sīþie, / wende fram wīge (251–2); or through the substitution of a general term for a particular or *vice versa,* as in: *Godwine ond Godwīg*...þone wudu sōhton, / flugon on þæt fæsten (192–4); *Ne*

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

mihte hē gehealdan heardne mēce, / wǣpnes wealdan (167–8); *Đā þǣr*
(1) (2)
wendon forð wlance þegenas, / unearge men efston georne (205–6). In the
(1) (2)
last besides the change from the particular *þegenas* to the general *men*, there is a difference in the qualifying words *wlance* and *unearge*, and *georne* in the second is additional. The following instance illustrates a more lengthy use of the parallel construction, each part adding a few details not contained in the other: Gegremod wearþ se gūðrinc, hē mid
(1)
gāre stang / wlancne wīcing þe him þā wunde forgeaf. / Frōd wæs se
(2)
fyrdrinc, hē lēt his francan wadan / þurh þæs hysses hals (138–41). This instance well illustrates, moreover, the love of variation, showing as it does the poet's care to change even an unimportant word like *wearþ* into *wæs*.

The love of variation gave rise to the use of substantival and verbal circumlocutions. The simplest kind of the former is the ordinary use of synonyms. This is exemplified by the different names applied to weapons: *rand, bord, scyld, lind*, for 'shield'; and even at a sacrifice of accuracy[1], as in *swurd, mēce*, for 'sword'; *gār, daroð, franca*, for 'spear.'

Also, by the substitution of the more general *stæþ* for the more particular *ēastæþ* or the poetic form *ōfer*. A more complicated form consisted of kennings. These were not merely synonyms, but poetic circumlocutions. The instances which occur in *Maldon* may be classified as follows:

(*a*) Those which are formed by figure of speech:
  (i) Synecdoche (material for object): *æsc* (43), *hringloca* (145).
    (accompaniment): *gārrǣs* (32),
  (ii) Metaphor: *wælwulf* (96), *æscholt* (268), *feorhhūs* (297),
  (iii) Euphemism: *gūðplega* (61), *wīgplega* (268),
  (iv) Metonymy: *wælstōw* (95).

(*b*) Compounds of which the first part denotes origin: *æschere* (69), *helsceaþa* (180).

(*c*) Names representing different aspects of
  (i) a deity: *Metod* (175), *þēoda Waldend* (173), *Đēoden engla* (178),
  (ii) a social superior: *folces ealdor* (202), *hæleþa hlēo* (74), *wigena hlāford* (135).

(*d*) An adjective used as a noun: *forheard* (156), *heorra* (204), *betera* (276).

[1] Thus, Byrhtnōð's sword is termed *mēce*, but seems to have been a *seax*; and *gār* and *daroð* are applied to the same weapon.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

These are all of a commonplace nature. Some (i.e. *Metod* and *wælstōw*) occur in the prose of the *Chronicle*; others are found in other poems, even in the earliest. Thus *æsc* = 'spear' occurs in *Beowulf*, l. 1772, and *æscholt* in *Beowulf*, l. 330. Their hackneyed character probably shows that they had passed from the stage of conscious kenning into that of mere synonym, and it is more than likely that their effect on the modern reader exceeds that on the Old English audience. They present a strong contrast with the picturesque kennings of the earlier poems, as a few examples taken from *Beowulf* will show: For the 'sea' are used *hronrād* (*B.* 10), *swan-rād* (*B.* 200), *ganotes bæð* (*B.* 1861); for 'sun,' *rodores candel* (*B.* 1572), *woruld candel* (*B.* 1965); for 'sword,' *fēla lāf* (*B.* 1032), *homera lāf* (*B.* 2829); for the human body, *bān-loca* (*B.* 742), *bān-cofa* (*B.* 1445), *bān-hūs* (*B.* 2508), etc. Many of the kennings in the earlier poems were probably invented for the occasion, but the majority even in the earliest works were hackneyed, showing a tendency to become conventional even at that early date. The absence from *Maldon* of fresher and more original kennings suggests that by the year 991 this form of variation had become completely subject to convention.

Another form of substantival variation was the use of a general term for one of narrower denotation, or *vice versa*, as *hæþen* (55), *wīcing* (26), *brim-līþend* (27), *brim-men* (295) for *Dene*; or the use of a poetic term for a more ordinary one, as *frēa* for *hlāford*, *ōfer* for *stæþ*, *ēþel* for *lond*. There were also many cases where common nouns were appropriately substituted for proper names or titles. Thus, for 'Ēadweard' is found *būrþegn* (121), the term connoting closeness to Byrhtnōð in the fight and calling up a picture of the relation between *þegn* and lord. So Byrhtnōð when engaged in battle is referred to as *fyrdrinc* (140), and *gūðrinc* (138), and the bold pirate who attacks him is *wīges heard* (130). In the case of personal names, a common variation was a phrase denoting relationship. Byrhtnōð is spoken of as *Byrhtelmes bearn* (93), *Æþelrēdes eorl* (203), *Æþelrēdes þegen* (151), Wulfmær the younger is *Byrhtnōðes mæg* (114) and *his swustersunu* (115); Wīstān is *Þūrstānes sunu* and *Wīgelmes bearn* (300). In some cases the heroes of *Maldon* are known only by this kind of circumlocution. Thus, *Offan mæg* (5), *Sībyrhtes brōðor* (282), *Gaddes mæg* (287). One class of substitute for the personal name which was common in the earlier poems is not found in *Maldon*, viz. the tribal name used in the singular to denote the chief of the tribe. Thus, in *Beowulf* Hrōðgār is the Scylding, Hygelāc is the Gēat, and Ongenðēow is the Scylfing. Similarly, there were numerous

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

epic tribal names, e.g. *Gār-dene*, *Ār-Scyldingas*, etc. These seem to have disappeared from the national poetry, giving place to more exact or more commonplace terms. The raiders in *Maldon* are called (wrongly) *Dene*, and the native force *Ēastseaxe*, just as they are in the sober prose narrative of the *Chronicle*.

Circumlocutions for verbs are no less common than for nouns. The simplest form occurs when a verb is replaced by a verbal phrase, as *scyldas wegan* for *gangan*. A good many examples of this are to be found in *Maldon*. Thus, besides *scyldas wegan* (98), *linde beran* (99), and *gāras beran* (67) replace *gangan*. *Flēogan* is replaced by *flēam gewyrcan* (81), *fram beaduwe būgan* (185), *fram wīge wendan* (193), *fram wīgplegan wendan* (316), *gūðe forbūgan* (324). For *sweltan* are found *wælræste gecēosan* (113), *on wæle licgan* (279), *grund gesēcan* (287), *on hilde gecringan* (324), and *on here cringan* (292). Instead of *forhtian* are used *for fēore murnan* (259) and *fēores reccan* (260). In all these cases the concrete idea has been preferred to the abstract, a preference shown by primitive peoples in their ordinary speech and by poetic diction in all but the most sophisticated ages. The same tendency is seen in more complicated phrases; thus, 'to join up' is *forð beran gār tō gūðe* (12–13) or *tō þǣre hilde steppan* (8); *wordum mǣlan* = to speak (26, 43, 210), *wælstōwe wealdan* (95) = to conquer; *wǣpen niman* (253) = to fall in action; *mid handum healdan bord ond brād swurd* (14–15) or *wǣpna wealdan* (83) = to fight on; *hicgan tō handum* (4) or *hogian tō wīge* (128) = to be resolute; *fēðan lǣdan* (88) = to advance (of an army); *wæl fēol on eorþan* (126, 303) or *gār oft þurhwōd fǣges feorhhūs* (296–7) = *acriter pugnatum est*.

Turning from variation to mode of expression in general, one notices that ornamental epithets are common in *Maldon*. They are almost the only form of poetic adornment that the poet allows himself to use, but it is quite evident that the majority of his epithets are wholly conventional. Many of them were already hackneyed in the early poems. Epithets are given to three classes of things: persons, weapons, and personified objects. In applying them to persons, the *Maldon*-poet, following Old English usage, did not employ the 'Homeric epithet,' and each epithet has a degree of appropriateness to the context. Thus, at critical moments of battle the hero is termed *yrre ond ānrǣd* (44), or *stedefæste* (249); in moments of pride or victory he is *wlanc* (139, 205), and the epithet may be transferred to his horse (240). The youthful warrior is *wintrum geong* (210) or simply *geonga* (155); the veteran chief is *hār* (169). The warrior is *heard* (33, 266) or *wīgheard* (75), or else he is *snell* (29) with reference to the promptness of his courage;

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

or *unorne* (256); or in respect of his fierceness he is *gram* (262). One doomed, according to Wodenic beliefs, to fall in battle is *fæge* (105), the epithet surviving four hundred years of Christianity. The coward is stigmatised as *earh* (238). The enemy too has his distinguishing epithets: he is *lāþ* (86) or *hæþen* (181). God is styled *milde* (175).

The use of epithets with names of weapons was quite as common as with personal names. This was probably a survival from early times when the warrior regarded his sword or spear as having an individuality sufficient to warrant the possession of a special name. Thus, Hrunting, Nægling, and Mimming were famous swords in the old heroic tales. In *Maldon* the epithets applied to the sword are: *brād ond brūnecg* (163), *eald* (47), *heard* (167), *gerēnod* (161), *fealohilte* (166), and *gōd* (237). The last has survived in modern English poetic diction. The spear is *wāc* (43) in respect of its slender shaft, *ættren* (47) or *ættern* (146) with reference to its deadly character, *fēolheard* (108), *gegrunden* (109), *sūþerne* (134), and *blōdig* (154). These are less hackneyed than those applied to the sword, which was more honoured than the spear in the earlier poetry. Only one epithet is applied to the spear in *Maldon*, namely *cellod* (283). If Grein's emendation to *cellod* of the *celæs* in Hickes' transcription of *Finnsburg* is correct, the conventional use of the term is established. Other weapons and armour are not distinguished with epithets in *Maldon*.

Personification has led to the transference of personal epithets to abstract ideas like war, which is described as *grim* (61), or Byrhtnōð's reply to the pirates' envoy, which is characterised as *lāþre* (50). Twice epithets descriptive of nature are used, each time of the same object. The water of the Panta is termed *cald* (91), a conventional epithet; but the use of *scīr* (98) illustrates the effect of a change of surroundings on the national poetic diction. In the early poems the traditional aspects of the sea are its roughness and its brown (*fealu*) colour. The migration of the English to a country more to the south and their contact with nations still farther from the dark Northern waters evidently caused a change in the popular conception of the water of seas and estuaries.

Although the epithets of *Maldon* have for the most part a conventional character, yet considerable changes had taken place in the list of available adjectives between the period of the early poems and the date of *Maldon*. Words like *eotenisc*, *ēacen*, and the like, whose associations were bound up with the mythology of the ancient Woden religion, must have found it difficult to survive centuries of Christianity, and, though

Digitized by Google Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

some of them, like *fæge*, succeeded in doing so, yet the majority of them probably went out of use along with the epic allusions of the older literature. On the other hand, new conditions and the march of events caused others to be introduced in the later period which were unknown to the earlier. Such, for instance, is *sūþerne* (134), which refers to the origin of the weapon[1], and *scīr* already discussed above.

Besides kennings and epithets, there were other forms of conventional phraseology which found a place in *Maldon*. The most striking were the poetic or 'epic' formulas. Of these the commonest in the earlier poetry was the *maþelode*-formula, introducing a set speech. It occurs twice in *Maldon*: *Byrhtnōð maþelode, bord hafenode* (42) and *Byrhtwold maþelode, bord hafenode* (309). As a variant the poet used *wordum mælde* (26, 43, 210), or simply *gemælde*: *Offa gemælde, æscholt āscēoc* (230); *Lēofsunu gemælde, ond his linde āhōf* (244). The use of these variations was a sign of the passing of the old formula. There also occurs the formula *gehȳrde ic þæt*...(117). In the older poetry this had been a variant of the *gefrignan*-formula, which naturally finds no place in an original poem. *Gehȳrde ic þæt*...in *Maldon* may be either an otiose formula or it may be significant, indicating that the poet had heard his facts from someone who had witnessed them while he himself was absent from the fight altogether or was in another part of the battle.

Some conventional phrases were based on a verse matrix. The most important of these was the phrase of three words (noun, adj. or verb + prep. or conj. + noun, adj. or verb) forming a first half-line of A type with double alliteration. The most obvious instances are those which repeat the same idea: *habban ond healdan* (236), *ord ond īren* (253), *hēow ond hȳnde* (324), and are practically parallelisms. Others vary the sense: *yrre ond ānræd* (44), *brād ond brūnecg* (163), both of which occur in identical form in earlier poems. Others vary the syntactical relation of the two chief words. Within the verse matrix it was possible to modify the ending of either of the chief words or to change the relational particle. *Maldon* is not extensive enough to supply sufficient examples to illustrate this and recourse must be had to *Beowulf*. There are found all the stages of the modification of the phrase within the matrix. The first stage is the change in ending of one or both of the chief words: *hæleðum tō helpe* (*B.* 1709) becomes *hæleða tō helpe* (*B.* 1830). Then as the stereotyped nature of the phrase became more recognised, the poet ventured to change the preposition. Thus, *āna wið eallum* (*B.* 145) became *ān æfter eallum* (*B.* 2268). The *þegenas tō þearfe* of *Maldon*

[1] Sweet and Wyatt both attach this meaning to *sūþerne*, but Sedgefield disagrees.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

(l. 232) stands in this relation to *þegn æt þearfe* in *Beowulf* (l. 2709). Similarly, *eorl on eorþan* (*M.* 233) and *eorla ofer eorþan* (*B.* 248). The next stage is a change in an unaccented syllable of one of the main words or the variation of the second component of a compound: *eald ond unhār* (*B.* 357) becomes *eald ond unfrōd* (*B.* 2449). A step further is reached in *beāgas ond brād-gold* (*B.* 3105) and *bēagas ond brego-stōl* (*B.* 2370), where the second of the chief words is changed, the alliterating consonant being alone retained. Lastly, there comes the time when either of the chief words or the particle may be varied without destroying the matrix. Thus, *hæleþum tō hande* (*B.* 1983), *hæleðum be healfe* (*B.* 2262), *hæleð in hoðman* (*B.* 2458), *hæleð under heofenum* (*B.* 52); *eald ond egesfull* (*B.* 2929), *eald ond ōmig* (*B.* 2763); *fāh ond fæted* (*B.* 2701), *fāh ond fȳrheard* (*B.* 305).

Examples from *Maldon* are common. Thus: *fūs ond forðgeorn* (281; cp. *B. fūs ond fæge*, 1241); *gōd on grēote* (315; cp. *B. gold on grēote*, 3167); *bord tō gebeorge* (131, 245), *bēagas wið gebeorge* (31); *guman tō gūðe* (94), *gār tō gūðe* (13), *gār ond gōd swurd* (237); *rād ond rædde* (18); *wigan mid wæpnum* (126), *wigan tō wīge* (235); *hæleð on healle* (214); *frȳnd ond gefēran* (229); *frēan on folce* (259); *hāle tō hāme* (292); *folc ond foldan* (54); *gearo ond geornful* (274); *fæste mid folman* (21), *fæste wið fēondum* (103); *tīr æt getohte* (104).

It was part of the scop's business to have these matrices at his fingertips, so that the phrases could be varied to suit circumstances. Hence, proper names could be worked in, as in: *Godrīc fram gūðe* (187) and *Godrīc tō gūðe* (321), so long as alliteration could be secured. In the half-line *Ælfere ond Maccus* (80), the names did not alliterate and the poet was unable to manipulate the phrase. As a rule such untractable phrases are placed in the second half-line, as *flōd æfter ebban* (65; cp. *flōd æfter faroðe*, *B.* 580), but they do not serve the same purposes as those in the first half-line. By means of variation the scop was generally able to overcome difficulties without having recourse to the second half-line, and the custom of giving alliterating names in families helped him not a little in dealing with personal names.

These phrases occupy a place in every seven lines of *Maldon*. Besides their numerical importance, they had a literary significance which cannot be ignored. Their chief uses were three. (i) They expressed parallelisms, e.g. *Ongan þā winas manian, / frynd ond gefēran* (228–9); *nū ūre þēoden līð, / eorl on eorþan* (232–3); see also ll. 245 and 315. (ii) They expanded and explained preceding ideas, e.g. *Ðær wurdon Oddan bearn ærest on flēame: / Godrīc fram gūðe* (186–7); *Ond*

Digitized by Google Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

his brōþru mid him bēgen ærndon, / Godwine ond Godwīg (191–2); *Ðonne wē on bence bēot āhōfon, / hæleð on healle, ymbe heard gewinn* (213–4). (iii) They emphasised a pair of attributes, e.g. *Ðā Byrhtnōð brād bill of scēaþe, / brād ond brūnecg* (162–3); *Ðāgȳt on orde stōd Ēadweard se langa, / gearo ond geornful* (273–4); *Swā dyde Æþerīc æþele gefēra, / fūs ond forðgeorn, feaht eorneste* (280–1). A fourth use which was very striking in earlier poems is perhaps not found in *Maldon*. This was the bringing of a long period to an emphatic, yet majestic close. (Cp. *B.* 224, 1417, 1430.) Something of this use is seen in Offa's speech beginning at l. 231, where the hortatory first portion closes with *gār ond gōd swurd*.

There are other stereotyped phrases which cannot be classified, but which occur in identical form in other poems, thus showing their conventional character. Such are *linde bǣron* (99; cp. *B.* 2365); *hār hilderinc* (169; cp. *B.* 1307, 3136; *Brunanburh*, 39); *flēon fōtes trym* (247; cp. *B.* 2525); *on hyra sylfra dōm* (37; cp. *B.* 2147); *lāþre spell* (50; cp. *B.* 3029); *þā hwīle þe hē mid wǣpna wealdan mōste* (83, 272; cp. *B.* 1509, 2038); *hwā þǣre wælstōwe wealdan mōte* (95; cp. *B.* 2051, 2984); *ongēan gramum* (100; cp. *B.* 1034).

Sometimes it is the idea which is conventional, though the expression is not stereotyped. Thus, *hæleða hlēo* (74), *wælræste gecēas* (113; cp. *B. Godes lēoht gecēas*, 2469); *swenges ne wyrnde* (118; cp. *B.* 1520); *þæs him his þēoden þanc gesǣde* (120; cp. *B.* 1809); *wæl fēol on eorþan* (126, 303; cp. *B.* 1042); *wæs mīn ealda fæder Ealhelm hāten* (218; cp. *B.* 373, 1457); *fæhðe gemunde* (225; cp. *B.* 2689); *habban ond healdan* (236; cp. *B.* 658); *ne for fēore murnan* (259; cp. *B.* 1442); *him wæs Æscferð nama* (267; cp. *B.* 1457); *wǣpen niman* (252; cp. *B.* 1123); *hē mid orde ānne gerǣhte flotan* (226–7) and *hē on þǣm fǣrsceaþan feorh gerǣhte* (142; cp. *B.* 556); *sēo byrne sang gryrelēoþa sum* (284–5; cp. *B.* 1521–2). But the most important conventional notion is the hovering of ravens and eagles over the battlefield (ll. 103–107), awaiting their feast on the bodies of the slain. The same idea is found in *Brunanburh* (60–65), in *Beowulf* (3021–7), and *Exodus* (162–7), the wolf being added to the birds. It is interesting to note that these carrion-eaters also appear on the Bayeux Tapestry over the scene of the last stand at Hastings. The idea even survived the Conquest and is found in *The Owl and the Nightingale*, ll. 385, 389–90 (C text). In establishing the conventionality of phrases and ideas, it has been deemed sufficient to refer to *Beowulf* alone, but the references might have been extended to the whole of the extant Old English poems, so conventional was the scop's method.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

The employment of figures of speech was limited in Old English poetry. Comparatively few figures were used at all, and such as were used were largely confined to the kennings. It was on the kennings therefore that a scop depended for most of his poetic colouring. But, as was said before, the kennings in *Maldon* are commonplace and relatively few. Hence, it is not surprising that the most conspicuous quality of the style of *Maldon* is its plainness. Apart from kennings, there is only one metaphor, namely, *sēo byrne sang gryrelēoþa sum* (284–5), and the rhetorical figure of understatement which had been a favourite trope in the earlier poems is completely absent. Crudities, such as the zeugma, had been outgrown, but the mechanical device of the parenthesis remained. Even this occurs in *Maldon* more rarely than in the earlier poems, though it is frequent enough to deserve detailed treatment here.

Two kinds of parenthesis are used. The first is parenthetic in sense only, being connected syntactically with the main sentence. One type of this kind occurs in narrative passages and contains a comment on the action. Two examples are found in *Maldon*. The first (l. 190) is a mere tag, evidently inserted to fill up the line; but the second (ll. 195–7) possesses the interest of demonstrating the progress in skill made by the scops since the days of the composition of *Beowulf*. While parenthetic comments on action are inserted so abruptly in *Beowulf* as to cause some modern critics to regard them as later interpolations, the instances in *Maldon* are introduced naturally and with perfect skill. A second type of sense parenthesis occurs between the formula introducing a speech and the speech itself. This is one of the features of the poem often characterised as 'epic,' because such parentheses are found in Classical epics. They are however far more frequent in Old English poetry and form one of the most important details of style. The simplest form, consisting of an appositional parallel (cp. *B.* 371, etc.: *Hrōþgār maþelode, helm Scyldinga*), is not found in *Maldon*. There the formula introducing the speech is expanded either (i) by a description of an accompanying act of the speaker: e.g. *Offa gemǣlde, æscholt āscēoc* (230); or (ii) even further by adding a parallel verbal phrase which amplifies the meaning of the formal *maþelode* or its substitute[1] and sometimes states the purpose of the speech or its subject: e.g. *Đā stōd on stæþe, stīþ-līce clypode, / wīcinga ār, wordum mǣlde, / sē on bēot ābēad brimlīþendra / ǣrænde tō þām eorle, þǣr hē on ōfre stōd* (25–28); *Byrhtnōð maþelode,*

[1] The *Maldon*-poet uses *maþelode* twice only, preferring less formal expressions like *wordum mǣlde, gecwæð, gemǣlde*, etc.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

bord hafenode, / wand wācne æsc, wordum mælde, / yrre ond ānræd, āgeaf him andsware (42–44); *Đāgȳt þæt word gecwæð / hār hilderinc, hyssas bylde, / bæd gangan forð gōde gefēran, / ne mihte þā on fōtum leng fæste gestandan; / hē tō heofenum wlāt* (168–72). Other examples are found in ll. 209–11, 244–5, 255–8. These parentheses are markedly more varied than those of the corresponding type in earlier poems and this, together with a less degree of abruptness, indicates a step forward on the road toward total disuse. It is also noticeable that they are longer than the corresponding type in early poems. Those in *Maldon* have a steady average of 2½ lines each, those in *Beowulf* and *Exodus* rarely exceeding two.

The second kind of parenthesis consists of an absolute construction, and is thus a pure parenthesis. Modern editors enclose it between brackets or dashes. It is either explanatory, as in l. 76, where the parenthesis identifies Wulfstān, and in l. 309 (*Byrhtwold maþelode, bord hafenode, / —sē wæs eald genēat—æsc ācwehte, / hē ful baldlīce beornas lærde*), where Byrhtwold's social status is given; or it may record concomitant circumstances, as in ll. 91–92: *Ongan ceallian þā ofer cald wæter / Byrhtelmes bearn* (*beornas hlyston*). In the last two examples the absolute parenthesis is embedded in a sense parenthesis introducing a speech. When so used, the absolute parenthesis was often of some length in the early poems, as for example in the description of the sword-hilt in *Beowulf* which occurs in the introduction to Hrōðgār's 'sermon' (*B.* 1687–99). In *Maldon* it is always short and belongs to the half-line type so characteristic of *Exodus*, but by no means infrequent in other early poems. As it interferes with clearness and interrupts the narrative, it must be regarded as a defect of style. Poetic style had almost outgrown it by 991, it would seem, since *Maldon* contains only three instances.

Poetic amplification does not play a conspicuous part in *Maldon*. In its character of a late work and a plain account of an event recorded in the *Chronicle*, the poem omits all reference to the old Germanic heroic tales and includes no episodic digressions. Nor does its mood vary from simple, though lofty, narrative, avoiding the dramatic and the lyrical and even keeping clear of the favourite elegiac strain. Didacticism, which is so common in Old English poems, is also absent here, and comment occurs in two places only (190, 195–7). There are no picturesque descriptions of nature. Indeed, so meagre is the reference to scenery that the site of the battle has remained unknown. The attributes of *cald* and *scīr* given to the water of the Panta are the only notes on

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

impersonal objects. In fact, the only approach to the amplification of the longer poems of earlier periods is contained in the passage on the birds of prey and the description of Byrhtnōð's weapons at his fall. The poet, however, has his own method of amplification. He narrates in great detail the account of the parley which preceded the battle, relating the speeches in what purport to be the very words of the speakers; he describes minutely the part played by Byrhtnōð, recording the result of every blow the earl deals, the exact circumstances of his fall, and his dying words. He mentions the formation adopted by the East Saxon force and gives little details such as the trimming of the ranks by the mounted leader, who later dismounts for battle, the post chosen by the leader and the reasons for his choice. If the defence of the bridge is not as vividly related as Byrhtnōð's fall, it certainly is not lacking in detail. After Byrhtnōð's fall, the part played by those who distinguished themselves by bravery, skill, or leadership, or made themselves infamous by cowardice is fully described, and the exhortations of the heroes are recorded word for word. Details of ancestry, character, and rank are supplied with many of the warriors mentioned. In this way without introducing any irrelevant matter the poet has worked up the three sentences of the *Chronicle* (MS. 'A') into a poem of over 325 lines.

The vocabulary of *Maldon* contains no archaisms either in word or form, and poetic words are of comparatively rare occurrence. Compounds which were of striking frequency in early poems are less frequent here. There is one compound in every 5·33 lines (approx.) and a new compound in every six lines. New compounds occur twice as often in *Beowulf*, and the proportion of frequency of all compounds is 2 : 5·33. On the other hand, *Maldon* contains a number of Scandinavian words which had been introduced by the wicings who settled in the country during the early period of raids. Of these four are purely Scandinavian in origin: *wīcing* (26), *griðian* (35), *ceallian* (91), and *dreng* (149); while the meaning of *eorl* has been affected by that of the Norse *jarl*. The occurrence of these words shows (i) that the poem was probably written in the dialect of East Anglia, where the settlement of Scandinavian raiders had been great, and (ii) that the words were generally understood in Wessex, or else the scribe would have substituted more intelligible words. It is also worthy of note that *ceallian* has been subjected to W.S. phonetic development. There are also a number of words new to the language: (*a*) new-coined verbs: *forhtian*, *derian*, *spēdian*, *geforðian*, *lȳtlan*; (*b*) nouns which changed circumstances had given rise to since

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

the period of early literature: *æschere, fyrd, fyrd-rinc, būrþegn, ealdorman, gefēra, gȳsel, genēat*; (*c*) adjectives of the same kind: *sūþerne* (= 'from Southern Europe'); (*d*) words whose meaning had been modified: as *brimlīþend* (formerly = 'seafarer,' here = 'pirate'); (*e*) miscellaneous loan-words like *engel, franca* (?), *prasse* (?). Among the last may be placed the personal name *Maccus*, whose termination indicates a Latin origin. It is clear, therefore, that the development of poetic vocabulary had been considerable.

The syntax of *Maldon* also shows signs of development as compared with that of the early poems. There are no archaic constructions, and the frequency of empty words (i.e. pronouns, prepositions, conjunctions, and articles) is far greater. There are 795 empty words in the 325 lines of the poem, i.e. 2·5 per line (approx.). That is nearly twice as many as in *Beowulf*. 'Lichtenheld's test' is one aspect of the general truth that empty words were more and more used in Old English poetry as time went on. Another aspect of the same truth is the greater frequency in early poems of lines consisting of nouns and verbs only. *Maldon* has twelve such lines, while *Beowulf* contains more than fifty in every 325 lines. The use of the partitive genitive, especially in dependence on *fela*, was a feature of early syntax which gradually became rarer, as the following table shows:

	Early (almost certainly)		Date Unknown	Late	
	Exodus	*Beowulf*	*A Father's Instruction*	*Brunanburh*	*Maldon*
1 instance per	9·28 ll.	9·92 ll.	18·8 ll.	24·3 ll.	23·22 ll.

Besides the quantitative there is also a qualitative difference between the instances in *Maldon* and those in the early poems, namely, that in the latter the partitive phrase is usually striking and emphatic, occupying a half-line by itself, whereas in *Maldon* its importance is small and its position in the half-line inconspicuous. Moreover, the type of phrase in which the partitive genitive depends on a superlative (e.g. *healærna mæst*), though of frequent occurrence in the early poems, occurs once only in *Maldon*[1]. This latter type seems therefore to have almost disappeared from Old English poetry of the tenth century.

A distinct tendency is seen in *Maldon* towards closing the sentence at the end of the line. In the earlier periods the practice was to close the sentence at the caesura. The *Maldon*-poet prefers to run his sentences on over the caesura to finish at the end of the line. The closing

[1] It does not occur at all in *A Father's Instruction* or *Brunanburh*.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

half-line is often a tag (cp. ll. 20–21: *ond bæd þæt hyra randas rihte hēoldon/fæste mid folman ond ne forhtedon nā*, where the last half-line is very weak), connected with the previous sentence by *ond* (4, 8, 21, 41, 69, 131, 161, 163, 244), by a relative pronoun (48, 139, 148, 174, 185, 190, 325), or some other connective word (*þā*: 10, 121, 276; *þǣr*: 28; *gif*: 34; *ǣr*: 61, 279; *þæt*: 137, 204, 229, 240; *þe*: 313; *oþþe*: 208; *ne*: 259; *oþþæt*: 324). That is a total of 31 out of 107 end-stopped lines in *Maldon*[1].

To sum up, the style of Old English poetry as exemplified in *Maldon* had undergone considerable development since the early period of literature. It had outgrown the defects of irrelevance and archaism, and had almost cured itself of the obscurity due to involved parallelisms and parenthetic notes; it had lost the abruptness of immaturity only too visible in the early poems and had acquired a degree of mellowness; and it had polished up the crudities of language and syntax which abound in earlier works. The vocabulary and syntax of the poem prove that considerable growth had taken place since the pre-Alfredian era. On the other hand, poetic style fully retained the use of variation in subject-matter, phrase, and word, and its phraseology had reached a stage of the utmost conventionality. Yet it was redeemed by its simplicity, for it used few figurative expressions, avoided the ornament of poetic allusion, contained no passages of high poetic colouring and no picturesque descriptions of nature. And in its plain, though lofty, style is perhaps seen the high-water mark of Old English narrative verse.

E. D. Laborde.

Harrow-on-the-Hill.

[1] Wyatt's punctuation.

Digitized by Google

Original from
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

THOMAS RAVENSCROFT'S THEATRICAL ASSOCIATIONS.

It is somewhat remarkable that the connexion of Thomas Ravenscroft, the musician, with the boy-players of Saint Paul's at the close of the sixteenth century should not hitherto have been suspected. Apart from certain corroborative evidence whose bearing is not so readily apparent, the fact might have been deduced with ease by any intelligent theatrical researcher who had chanced upon Ravenscroft's own statement regarding his master, Edward Pearce. But theatrical researchers seldom concern themselves with musical matters, and some excuse for the delay in arriving at the truth may otherwise be found not only in the scantiness and inaccuracy of the details that have come down to us relative to Ravenscroft but in the blinding confusion they have occasioned. On the strength of a reference to his age as twenty-two in one of the prefatory addresses to his *Brief Discourse* in 1614, Ravenscroft's birth is generally assigned to 1592, but Dr E. H. Fellowes has been shrewd enough to see that the event must have occurred a few years earlier[1]. Though he is probably right in his surmise that the Latin epigram in which the statement regarding Ravenscroft's age is made was written some considerable time before it was published, his reasons for arriving at that opinion are not so conclusive, since he has no suspicion of (what I hope to demonstrate) the remarkable precocity of the composer. Hitherto it has been believed that Ravenscroft took his degree of Bachelor of Music at Cambridge in 1607, and Dr Fellowes, relying on that date, thinks he must have been more than fifteen when he received his degree and more than seventeen when he published *Pammelia* and *Deuteromelia*. Doubtless he would have been still more incredulous had he known what Dr Venn's *Book of Matriculation and Degrees, Cambridge, 1544–1659* has since revealed, viz. that 'Thomas Rangcroft' became Bachelor of Music in 1605. I hope now to advance evidence warranting the inference that Ravenscroft was seventeen at that date and born in 1588.

It is in the eulogium of his mentor in his introduction to *A Brief Discourse* that one finds the clue to Ravenscroft's birth-date and to his interesting association with Paul's playhouse:

[1] *English Madrigal Composers*, p. 271.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Maister *Edward Pearce* the first, sometimes Maister of the Children of Saint *Paules* in London, and there my Maister, a man of singular eminency in *his Profession*, both in the *Educating* of *Children* for the ordering of the *voyce* so, as the *Quality* might afterward *credit* him and *preferre* them: And also in those his *Compositions* to the Lute, whereof the world enjoyes many (as from the Maister of that Instrument) together with his skilfull Instructions for other Instruments too, as his fruits can beare him witnesse.

It is a misfortune that the exact date of Pearce's appointment to the Mastership of the Choir-boys of St Paul's remains matter of doubt, and that we cannot determine why his predecessor, Thomas Giles, who had years of activity still remaining to him, should have been superseded. Pearce had been for some ten years previously a Gentleman of the Chapel Royal, and his promotion to the Mastership is generally fixed at August 15, 1600, the date when his successor in the Chapel choir was appointed. But it may be that he had resigned considerably earlier, and (though, frankly, one can find no precedent for the delay) that the position remained for some months in abeyance. One is inclined to believe that the reopening after a ten years' lapse of the little playhouse in Paul's Singing School came as a natural consequence of Pearce's accession to the Mastership, and that, too, in face of the ugly circumstance that the reopening must have taken place some months before August 1600, hardly later, indeed, than the December of 1599[1]. But all we really know for certain about the matter, beyond the approximate date of his appointment, is that Pearce was paid for a court performance given by the Paul's Boys on New Year's Day 1601, and that he remained in control of Paul's playhouse until it ceased to function in 1607. As it happens, however, the suspicion of an earlier association can receive some bolstering not only from what Ravenscroft tells us of his training, but from certain theatrical music which he has preserved.

In what capacity Ravenscroft figured at Paul's playhouse early in its final period, whether as player, singer, musician, or one and all, it would be idle to conjecture, but that he was employed on the boards in some way is fairly well assured, since all the choir-boys took part in the performances there. It is, however, satisfactory to be able to demonstrate that, notwithstanding his extreme youth, he actually composed music for some of the plays. Pearce himself occasionally provided vocal settings for some of the new pieces, and his music for a song in *Blurt, Master Constable* is still extant. His solicitude for the advancement of his pupils seems to have urged him to foster the gift of any boy whom he found trying his hand at composition, and what greater delight could

[1] Cf. E. K. Chambers, *The Elizabethan Stage*, II, p. 19.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

a musical prodigy have than to hear his music rendered on the stage? (Sir Charles Villiers Stanford experienced it at the age of nine.) Few students of the early drama will need to be told what an important part song, dance and incidental music played in the productions at Paul's, but those who are ignorant on the point can readily assure themselves by a careful examination of Marston's or Middleton's early plays. As for the rest, it is fitting to assume that Ravenscroft was eleven in 1599 and that he joined the Paul's choir in that year, since on that supposition his voice would have broken in 1604, shortly before the time when he repaired to Cambridge. I take leave to think that the years just mentioned form the inclusive dates of his association with Paul's playhouse, and that any music written by him for that house must have been written within that period.

Now comes the vital new evidence. On July 24, 1600, there was entered on the Stationers' Register shortly before publication an anonymous Paul's play called *The Maydes Metamorphosis*, long mistakenly assigned to Lyly but at present more generally believed to be the work of Day. If Day's, it was a new play; if not, there is just the possibility that it was a revival. The important point in connexion with it is that two dances to unaccompanied song occur in the second act, and that the words and music for these dances, together with the names of the composers, are given in Ravenscroft's *Brief Discourse*:

(1) The Urchins' Dance. ('By the moon we sport and play.') Music by T. Ravenscroft.

(2) The Elves' Dance. ('Round about, round about.') Music by John Bennet.

Though it is requisite to draw attention to the slight discrepancies which exist between the words of the songs as given by Ravenscroft and as they occur in the quarto, the fact should not prove disturbing. Madrigalists were prone to take all sorts of liberties with the lyrics entrusted to them, not only interpolating and varying phrases, but making alterations in the lines to suit the particular musical trend. There was this distinction, however, between Bennet and Ravenscroft (apart from the puzzle as to how Bennet got into that galley), that in 1599 the one was an adult and the other a boy. But if young Ravenscroft had not the capacity to adapt a lyric for his purposes[1], he at least had Pearce to help him. It would be idle to attempt to smooth out the

[1] In Chapman's *Monsieur D'Olive*, IV, 2 (a Blackfriars boys' play of 1606), D'Olive, commending Dicque the page, says, 'Pretty little wit, i' faith: can he verse?' And Pacque, the other page, replies, 'Ay, and set, too, my lord; he's both a setter and a verser.'

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

difficulties by suggesting that the music for the two songs was written at a slightly later period, since it can be shown by other and equally new evidence that Ravenscroft was composing for the Paul's theatre precisely at this juncture.

By way of prelude to this further discovery, it is essential that one should stress the resemblance between the titles of the anonymous Paul's play under discussion and Lyly's *Love's Metamorphosis*, especially as both were entered on the Stationers' Register within the space of a few months, the one in July and the other in November 1600. Lyly's old play had originally been produced by the Paul's Boys about 1590, but the titlepage of the quarto of 1601 shows that it had recently been appropriated by their resuscitated rivals, the Children of the Chapel, at Blackfriars. This similarity of titles points to a keen competition between the two, and the revival of *Love's Metamorphosis* likewise indicates some renewal of interest in Lyly's dramaturgy. Here we have a clue to a puzzle in which Ravenscroft figures. There are potent reasons for believing that Lyly's *Endimion* was brought out again at Paul's, the house of its origin. Produced in 1588, the play gains factitious importance from the fact that it introduced the element of faery into English drama and is thought to have yielded the prototype (in the song and dance of fairies in Act IV, sc. 2) of the sham fairy song in *The Merry Wives of Windsor*. Scepticism, however, on this point has of late years made considerable headway owing to the fact that Lyly's song remained unprinted until Blount reissued the play in 1632, a delay which has led to the unjustifiable condemnation of it and other lyrics in Blount's collected edition of the dramatist as forgeries. (By a curious parallelism the text of the Shakespearean song was also lacking before the appearance of the First Folio.)

Once we are in a position to postulate a revival of *Endimion* in 1600 things assume an entirely different aspect. Colour can be given with some plausibility to the presumed source of Shakespeare's inspiration, and we gain firmer foothold than hitherto as to the date of *The Merry Wives*. Here is the evidence.

In Ravenscroft's *Brief Discourse*, we find preserved at page 6 his own setting for four voices of a 'Fayries Daunce,' otherwise a dance to unaccompanied song, the words running as follows:

> Dare you haunt our hallowed greene,
> None but fairies here are seen.
> Down and sleep, wake and weep,
> Pinch him black and pinch him blue
> That seeks to steal a lover true.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

When you come to hear us sing
Or to tread our Fairy ring
Pinch him black and pinch him blue,
O thus our nails shall handle you.

One line in this song and one only has a differentiating quality, not only distinguishing it from all similar songs but revealing for what particular play it was written, and that it could not have been written otherwise than for a play. This is 'That seeks to steal a lover true.' Omit it and the song could well be sung to the antlered Falstaff at Herne's Oak. To become convinced that the song (both words and music) was written for some revival of *Endimion*, one need do little more than consider the situation in Act IV, sc. 2 of the play. Cynthia has punished Tellus for her offences by placing her under restraint and in the custody of Corsites, but the jailer has fallen in love with his fair prisoner and 'seeks to steal a lover true' by uniting with her in an attempt to remove Endymion from the lunary bank. All he succeeds in doing is to bring trouble on himself: by way of requital he is attacked by fairies and lustily pinched.

Here the quarto of 1591 has simply the stage direction (recalling Ravenscroft's song-title), 'The Fayries daunce and with a song pinch him, and he falleth asleepe; etc.' But on prosecuting further inquiry, a difficulty soon presents itself. We duly find the song in Blount and note that it likewise is for four voices, but there all resemblance ends. So radical is the verbal and structural difference between it and Ravenscroft's song that the distinction cannot be explained away by any theory of madrigalistic sophistication. In a word, we have to deal with entities, not variants. Here is the song as in Blount:

1 Fairy: Pinch him blue
2 Fairy: And pinch him blacke,
3 Fairy: Let him not lacke
Sharpe nails to pinch him blue and red,
Till sleepe has rock'd his addle head.
4 Fairy: For the trespasse hee hath done,
Spots ore all his flesh shall runne.
Kisse Endimion, kisse his eyes
Then to our midnight Heidegyes.

Since we cannot fall back on the discredited theory of the forging of the songs in the collected *Lyly* of 1632, we are bound to assume that Blount had by some means obtained possession of certain of Lyly's original manuscripts and printed the songs as they were first written and first sung. One finds no difficulty in supposing that, in the decade which had elapsed since the production of *Endimion*, the music of the song, if not the song itself, had disappeared. The difficulty would be to

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

concede the contrary. Losses of the sort were common, and it must be remembered that we are dealing now with an interrupted story, the story of a playhouse that had long been closed. Added to this, plays were generally refurbished on revival in Elizabethan days. All things considered, there is no reason for surprise that the song should have been rewritten and fresh music provided.

Historical investigators are apt to catch at straws, and one is moved by a solitary circumstance to speculate as to whether Ravenscroft in after days returned to theatrical life. There seems to be some significance in the fact that early in 1618 he was one of the witnesses to the will of Richard Cowley, the actor, notable as the original Verges in *Much Ado*, the others being John Heminges, Cuthbert Burbadge and John Shank, all of whom were prominently associated with the fortunes of Shakespeare's old company. The Blackfriars Theatre, we know, was always distinguished for the quality of its music, and the Blackfriars had become the permanent winter house of the Globe players in 1609. Whether as musician or composer, it seems not unlikely that Ravenscroft had some employment there.

W. J. LAWRENCE.

MONKSTOWN,
COUNTY DUBLIN.

Digitized by Google
Original from
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

ANDRÉ CHÉNIER EN ANGLETERRE.

André Chénier débarqua à Londres le 6 décembre 1787. Il avait 25 ans. Il arrivait en Angleterre pour la première fois et venait remplir à Londres les fonctions de secrétaire particulier de notre ambassadeur, Monsieur de la Luzerne.

Il fit la traversée 'couché, souffrant,' comme l'indique une note qu'il mit à une courte pièce, ce qui ne l'empêcha pas de commencer à bord du bateau une description en vers de sa mauvaise traversée et de son état de santé. Il termina cette description à Londres le 10 décembre 1787.

Tout porte à croire que Chénier accepta de s'exiler et de devenir secrétaire pour cesser d'être à charge à son père. Son père, la même année, sollicitait la protection du gouvernement: 'J'ai quatre enfants à ma charge,' disait-il dans une lettre du 13 mars 1787, 'un, vice-consul à Alicante, qui aura besoin de mon secours; un, au service militaire, aspirant au génie, non encore reçu; deux cadets, adonnés à la littérature, qui annoncent des espérances à venir et qui ont besoin de secours présents.' C'était un moyen pour Chénier de ne plus avoir besoin de ces secours et de satisfaire au désir de sa famille qui souffrait de le voir inoccupé.

André Chénier avait pour ami François de Pange, avec qui il avait été élevé au Collège de Navarre. François de Pange avait pour amie Madame de Beaumont. Le père de Madame de Beaumont, Comte de Montmorin, était ministre des affaires étrangères depuis le 18 février 1767. C'est sur la recommandation de François de Pange et par l'intermédiaire de Madame de Beaumont qu'André Chénier obtint le poste de secrétaire particulier de notre ambassadeur à Londres.

Le séjour d'André Chénier à Londres semble dès le début lui avoir été pénible et être resté pénible jusqu'à la fin. On a cru qu'il y avait été heureux, du moins pendant quelque temps, et on s'est appuyé pour le croire sur un passage de la lettre que lui adressa son frère Marie-Joseph, le 13 février 1787: 'Vous vous plaisez à Londres et je m'y attendais. Je voudrais bien un jour pouvoir vous aller embrasser dans cette belle ville, avant de vous revoir à Paris.'

Il ne faudrait pas avoir trop grande confiance en ce témoignage.

Digitized by Google

Original from
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

D'abord cette lettre est, pendant les deux ans et demi que Chénier devait rester à Londres, le seul écrit qui puisse faire croire qu'il s'y soit plu. Or, un homme d'un caractère fier et indépendant—et on sait qu'il était fier et indépendant—n'avoue guère, même pas à son frère, peut-être même moins à son frère qu'à tout autre, qu'il a échoué dans sa recherche du bonheur. Les natures fières ne supportent point d'être un objet de pitié.

Il est fort probable aussi que la lettre d'André passerait sous les yeux de toute sa famille, de sa mère en particulier, et André aimait trop sa mère pour lui être une cause d'inquiétude, si légère fût-elle.

Dès le mois de décembre 1787, donc à peine arrivé, on le voit, lorsqu'il n'écrit plus pour les autres mais pour soi-même, se plaindre amèrement de sa solitude:

> Sans parents, sans amis, et sans concitoyens,
> Oublié sur la terre et loin de tous les miens,
> Par les vagues jeté sur cette île farouche,
> Le doux nom de la France est souvent sur ma bouche.
> Auprès d'un noir foyer, seul, je me plains du sort.
> Je compte les moments, je souhaite la mort ;
> Et pas un seul ami dont la voix m'encourage,
> Qui près de moi s'asseye, et, voyant mon visage
> Se baigner de mes pleurs et tomber sur mon sein,
> Me dise : 'Qu'as-tu donc ?' et me presse la main.

Le contraire eut été surprenant. Et, étant donné le caractère de Chénier, il devait forcément être aveugle aux qualités de l'Angleterre et souffrir profondément de ses défauts.

Sa santé délicate—depuis l'âge de vingt ans il souffrait de la gravelle, et il en souffrit toujours—ne lui permettait guère d'apprécier les charmes du climat, de la nourriture et de la vie britanniques. Son esprit païen, grec (grec par éducation, grec de sang aussi par sa mère), a-religieux, a-chrétien, se trouvait soumis à des influences de nature diamétralement opposée. Son tempérament voluptueux était plongé dans une atmosphère de puritanisme. Pauvre, il quittait la société de Paris du 18e siècle, où l'esprit tenait lieu d'argent, et où il ne s'était pas aperçu qu'il était pauvre, pour entrer dans un milieu aristocratique, snob, dont il dut supporter les sourires pleins de charité condescendante.

Ajoutons à cela son apparence, sa petite taille (il avait cinq pieds, deux pouces), ses épaules larges, sa tête trop grande, ses petits yeux, son teint brun. Placé au milieu des beaux aristocrates anglais, de ces hommes de six pieds, minces, aux grands yeux, au teint clair, il ne devait pas être sans faire intérieurement la comparaison et sans se sentir considérablement inférieur.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Tout cela n'était point fait pour flatter son amour propre, et dépaysé par cette atmosphère antipathique, assombri par ses infériorités, blessé dans son orgueil, déprimé par la maladie et la solitude, il souffrit du caractère anglais, il l'observa sans bienveillance, et comme nous le verrons à la fin de cet article, il le peignit sans justice.

A ces causes de souffrance s'en ajoutaient d'autres encore.

Dans sa nouvelle situation, Chénier souffrit du manque de liberté. Lui qui voulait

> Un jour, en des bords retirés,
> Sur un riche coteau ceint de bois et de prés,
> Avoir un humble toit, une source d'eau vive,
> . . . . . .
> Là...ignorant le monde et ses travaux,
> Loin du superbe ennui que l'éclat environne,
> Vivre, comme jadis, aux champs de Babylone,

se trouvait pris par ses devoirs de secrétaire dans la plus grande ville du monde et d'où il lui était le plus difficile, par suite, de s'échapper pour aller retrouver la nature.

Le milieu cérémonieux des ambassades s'accommodait peu, du reste, à son tour d'esprit. Il se déplut à Londres, somme toute, comme il s'était déplu cinq ans plus tôt à Strasbourg quand il était cadet-gentilhomme au régiment d'Angoumois. Et alors qu'il s'était fait au moins un ami à Strasbourg, le Marquis de Brazais, parce que ce marquis avait pour les lettres le même culte que Chénier, il ne se fit aucun ami à l'ambassade, parce qu'il n'y trouva personne qui eût pour les lettres le même amour que lui.

De plus, il laissait des amis à Paris : il laissait les deux de Pange, avec qui il était lié depuis son enfance. Il laissait les Trudaine, le poète Le Brun, le peintre David.

Bien plus, il y laissait des amours, des amours nombreuses et de toute sorte, sans doute, s'il faut l'en croire lorsqu'il nous dit, qu'il 'se livra souvent aux distractions et égarements d'une jeunesse forte et généreuse.' Il y laissait surtout Madame de Beaumont, la Camille de certaines de ses œuvres, qui avait dix ans de plus que lui, qui était une femme extrêmement distinguée, citée pour sa grâce et son élégance et qu'il aimait éperdument.

Pour lutter contre la solitude, la mélancolie, André Chénier se mit au travail. Pour tromper l'ennui, il écrivit. On a conservé de lui cette page qui serait une page de journal, si Chénier avait écrit pour soi tous les jours, et le passage, encore peu connu, est trop important pour qu'on ne m'excuse pas de le citer presque en entier, quoiqu'il soit long.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

London, Covent Garden, hood's tavern,
Vendredi, 3 avril 1789, à 7 heures
du soir.

Comme je m'ennuie fort ici, après y avoir assez mal dîné, et que je ne sais où aller attendre l'heure de se présenter dans quelque société, je vais tâcher de laisser fuir une heure et demie sans m'en apercevoir, en barbouillant un papier que j'ai demandé. Je ne sais absolument point ce que je vais écrire, je m'en inquiète peu. Quelque absurde et vide et insignifiant que cela puisse être (et cela ne saurait guère l'être autant que la conversation de deux Anglais qui mangent à une table à côté de moi, et qui écorchent de temps en temps quelques mots de français afin de me faire voir qu'ils savent ou plutôt qu'ils ne savent pas ma langue), je reverrai peut-être un jour cette rapsodie, et je ne me rappellerai pas sans plaisir (car il y en a à se rappeler le passé) la triste circonstance qui m'a fait dîner ici tout seul.

Ceux qui ne sont pas heureux aiment et cherchent la solitude. Elle est pour eux un grand mal encore plus qu'un grand plaisir : alors le sujet de leur chagrin se présente sans cesse à leur imagination, seul, sans mélange, sans distraction ; ils repassent dans leur mémoire, avec larmes, ce qu'ils y ont déjà repassé cent fois avec larmes ; ils ruminent du fiel ; ils souffrent des souffrances passées et présentes ; ils souffrent même de l'avenir ; car, quoique un peu d'espérance se mêle toujours au milieu de tout, cependant l'expérience rend méfiant, et cette inquiétude est un état pénible. On s'accoutume à tout, même à souffrir.—Oui, vous avez raison, cela est bien vrai.—Si cela n'était pas vrai, je ne vivrais pas, et vous qui parlez vous seriez peut-être mort aussi ; mais cette funeste habitude vient d'une cause bien sinistre : elle vient de ce que la souffrance a fatigué la tête et a flétri l'âme. Cette habitude n'est qu'un total affaiblissement : l'esprit n'a plus assez de force pour peser chaque chose et l'examiner sous son juste point de vue, pour en appeler à la sainte nature primitive et attaquer de front les dures et injustes institutions humaines ; l'âme n'a plus assez de force pour s'indigner contre l'inégalité factice établie entre les pauvres humains, pour se révolter à l'idée de l'injustice, pour repousser le poids qui l'accable. Elle est dégradée, descendue, prosternée ; elle s'accoutume à souffrir, comme les morts s'accoutument à supporter la pierre du tombeau, car ils ne peuvent pas la soulever. Voilà ce que c'est que s'accoutumer à tout, même à souffrir. Dieu préserve mes amis de cette triste habitude ! Les petits chagrins rendent tendre ; les grands rendent dur et farouche. Les uns cherchent la société, les distractions, la conversation des amis ; les autres fuient tout cela : car ils savent que tout cela n'a aucun pouvoir à les consoler, et ils trouvent injuste d'attrister les autres, surtout inutilement pour soi-même. Peut-être aussi ont-ils quelque pudeur de laisser voir à l'amitié qu'elle-même et son doux langage, et son regard caressant, et des serrements de main, ne peuvent pas guérir toutes les plaies ; et cependant la vue et les soins de mes amis m'ont toujours fait du bien, même s'ils ne m'ont pas entièrement guéri.

Mais ici je suis seul, livré à moi-même, soumis à ma pesante fortune, et je n'ai personne sur qui m'appuyer. Que l'indépendance est bonne ! Heureux celui que le désir d'être utile à ses vieux parents et à toute sa famille ne force pas à renoncer à son honnête et indépendante pauvreté ! Peut-être un jour je serai riche ; puisse alors le fruit de mes peines, de mes chagrins, de mon ennui, épargner à mes proches le même ennui, les mêmes chagrins, les mêmes peines ! Puissent-ils me devoir d'échapper à l'humiliation ! Oui, sans doute, l'humiliation. Je sais bien qu'il ne m'arrive rien dont mon honneur puisse être blessé. Je sais bien aussi que rien de pareil ne m'arrivera jamais, car cette assurance-là ne dépend que de moi seul ; mais il est dur de se voir négligé, de n'être point admis dans telle société qui se croit au-dessus de vous ; il est dur de recevoir, sinon des dédains, au moins des politesses hautaines ; il est dur de sentir...—Quoi ? qu'on est au-dessous de quelqu'un ?—Non ; mais il y a quelqu'un qui s'imagine que vous êtes au-dessous de lui. Ces grands, même les meilleurs, vous font si bien remarquer en toute occasion cette haute opinion qu'ils ont d'eux-mêmes ! Ils affectent si fréquemment de croire que la supériorité de la fortune tient à celle de leur mérite ! Ils sont bons si durement ! Ils mettent tant de prix à leurs sensations et à celles de leurs pareils, et si peu à celles de leurs prétendus inférieurs ! Si quelque petit chagrin a effleuré la vanité d'un de ceux qu'ils appellent leurs égaux, ils sont si chauds, si véhéments, si com-

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

patissants ! Si une cuisante amertume a déchiré le cœur de tel qu'ils appellent leur inférieur, ils sont si froids, si secs ! Ils le plaignent d'une manière si indifférente et si distraite ! comme les enfants qui n'ont point de peine à voir mourir une fourmi, parce qu'elle n'a point de rapport à leur espèce.

Je ne puis m'empêcher de rire intérieurement, lorsque dans ces belles sociétés je vois de fréquents exemples de cette sensibilité distinctive, et qui ne s'attendrit qu'après avoir demandé le nom. Les femmes surtout sont admirables pour cela : dès qu'un prince, qu'elles ont rencontré au bal, dès qu'un grand, qui est leur intime ami, car elles ont dîné avec lui deux fois, est malade ou affligé pour avoir perdu une place ou un cheval, elles y prennent tant de part ; elles déplorent son malheur de si bonne foi ! elles se récrient si pathétiquement ! et véritablement elles croient être au désespoir ; car, presque toutes étant dépourvues de la sensibilité franche et vraie et naïve, elles croient que ces singeries et ces vaines simagrées sont en effet ce que l'on entend par ce nom.

Allons, voilà une heure et demie de tuée ; je m'en vais. Je ne sais plus ce que j'ai écrit, mais je ne l'ai écrit que pour moi : il n'y a ni apprêt ni élégance. Cela ne sera vu que de moi ; et je suis sûr que j'aurai un jour quelque plaisir à relire ce morceau de ma triste et pensive jeunesse. Puisse un jour tout lecteur en avoir autant à lire et que j'aurai écrit pour tous les lecteurs !

Il eût été assez naturel aussi que Chénier, comme le fit Voltaire dans les mêmes circonstances, cherchât une consolation dans l'étude de la littérature du pays où le sort l'avait jeté. Or c'est précisément ce qu'il ne fit pas, ou, plus justement, ce qu'il fit peu. Il le fit un peu sans doute et dut montrer une certaine admiration pour Shakespeare dans une lettre à son frère, puisque celui-ci lui répondit dans la lettre déjà citée du 13 février 1787 : 'Vous me paraissez indulgent pour Shakespeare ; vous trouvez qu'il a des scènes admirables.' C'est la seule fois que nous voyons Chénier parler de Shakespeare avec faveur, et c'est encore dans une lettre. Quand il en parle dans ses notes personnelles, par exemple dans son *Essai sur les causes et les effets de la perfection et de la décadence des lettres et des arts* qui est de la même époque, il le fait d'un ton tout à fait différent. Après avoir fait l'éloge des Grecs, de 'leurs expressions vraies, humaines, nées dans l'homme et qui doivent toucher l'homme,' il ajoute : 'Ce ne sont pas là de ces convulsions barbares de Shakespeare, de ces expressions monstrueuses et tirées on ne sait d'où, de ces idées énormes et gigantesques qui, dans les poètes du Nord, fatiguent et rembrunissent l'âme sans la toucher, sans l'intéresser le moins du monde.'

De tous les poètes anglais, Young est le seul qu'il semble avoir pu apprécier : 'Ce n'est pas que Young n'ait souvent parlé le vrai langage de la passion, et que tout lecteur qui n'est pas de pierre ne pleure avec lui sur le tombeau de sa fille, mais la plupart de ces poètes du Nord, surtout anglais, se tourmentent toujours et en toute occasion ; leur douleur est un désespoir frénétique ; leurs plaintes, des hurlements ; leurs images n'ont point de modèles dans la nature ; leur expression est démesurée ou si quelquefois ils veulent envisager d'un œil insouciant et

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

philosophique les objets de la terreur du vulgaire, alors autre excès: ils en parlent avec un rire grimaçant et triste; ils revêtent ces idées de mort d'une gaieté bizarre et farouche, plus effrayante que l'objet même.'

On trouverait cette même opinion dans les vers de Chénier:

> Les poètes anglais, trop fiers pour être esclaves,
> Ont même du bon sens rejeté les entraves.
> Dans leur ton uniforme, en leur vaine splendeur
> Haletants pour atteindre une fausse grandeur,
> Tristes comme leur ciel toujours teint de nuages,
> Enflés comme la mer qui blanchit leurs rivages,
> Et sombres et pesants comme l'air nébuleux
> Que leur île farouche épaissit autour d'eux.

Le vrai de l'histoire est que Chénier ne comprit rien aux poètes anglais. Ce qu'il leur reprochait, et bien puérilement d'ailleurs, c'était uniquement de ne pas être des Grecs. Il était trop grec de goût et d'éducation pour pouvoir les apprécier. Il manqua de justice envers eux comme il en avait manqué envers le peuple anglais, au point même d'inscrire cette boutade monstrueuse dans l'*Essai sur la perfection et la décadence des lettres*: 'La langue française a peur de la poésie, et la poésie a peur de la langue anglaise.'

Faute de pouvoir prendre plaisir à la lecture des chefs-d'œuvres anglais, André Chénier employa ses efforts dans une autre direction. Il se mit à étudier l'orient, et en particulier les poèmes chinois et la poésie persane. C'est de cette époque que datent les nombreuses notes qu'il a laissées sur ces deux littératures. C'est pendant son séjour à Londres qu'il emprunta à la grammaire de Jones, *A Grammar of the Persian Language*, London, Richardson, 1771, une centaine de passages, vers, prose, fables, odes, que Jones avait traduit du persan et que Chénier copia tels quels en anglais pour s'en servir sans doute un jour.

Mais Chénier ne s'en tenait pas là. Cet essai dont nous avons parlé plus haut, *Essai sur les causes et les effets de la perfection et de la décadence des lettres et des arts*, est aussi de cette époque.

Il faisait aussi des vers qu'il envoyait à son frère, comme le prouve cette phrase d'une lettre de Marie-Joseph: 'Un des grands plaisirs que je puisse avoir est de recevoir de temps en temps de ces beaux vers que vous savez faire.' Il est probable que ces beaux vers dont parle Marie-Joseph sont le poème de *L'Invention*, cette préface de l'Hermès auquel Chénier pensait depuis longtemps, auquel aussi, à travers son voyage rapide en Italie, à travers sa vie parisienne, ses *Idylles*, ses *Poèmes antiques*, ses *Élégies*, il avait eu peu de temps de travailler. Il est probable par suite que c'est à Londres que Chénier renonça à l'imita-

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

tion servile des anciens, qu'il cessa de prendre leurs sujets et de les accommoder au goût moderne, pour—

... sans suivre leurs pas, imiter leur exemple,
Faire en s'éloignant d'eux avec un soin jaloux
Ce qu'eux-mêmes ils feraient s'ils vivaient parmi nous.

C'est donc de Londres que date l'originalité de Chénier, la condamnation de l'imitation, ce qu'on appelle dans les traités d'histoire littéraire la troisième manière de Chénier.

Il n'y fit point que des vers français. André Chénier était de ceux qui sont incapables de ne faire qu'une chose à la fois. 'Tu sais,' écrivait-il à François de Pange, 'combien mes muses sont vagabondes. Elles ne peuvent achever promptement un seul projet, elles en font marcher cent à la fois.' Ses muses, pendant son séjour à Londres, lui inspirèrent, en plus de cet essai et du poème de *L'Invention*, des vers latins, italiens et grecs. Les vers grecs qu'elles lui inspirèrent et qu'on connaît peu, parce que de nos jours on lit peu Chénier après le baccalauréat, parce qu'aussi ces vers grecs ne se trouvent pas dans les livres de classe, parce qu'enfin le grec est devenu, comme le sanscrit, l'apanage de quelques spécialistes, montrent Chénier sous un jour nouveau—Chénier poète érotique. Ces vers accompagnaient des dessins qu'il avait faits d'après nature et nous attestent aussi que Chénier n'était pas sans prendre des distractions variées:

I.

Vierges et nymphes britanniques, que Neptune qui environne et ébranle la terre a fait naître près des flots de la divine Tamise, dans Londres aux larges rues, vous qui avez un visage et un port de déesse, nymphes aux bras blancs, aux candides regards, aux blonds cheveux, au mol sourire, non, une autre terre ne nourrit pas de plus belles jeunes filles. De la jeune Caroline, qui n'est point la dernière de vous, j'ai dessiné cette image d'une belle, sans défaut, moi, cet André, d'origine française, qu'une mère thrace mit au monde près des rivages de l'Euxin.

II.

Dessiné d'après nature par André, peintre byzantin.

III.

André le Thrace a dessiné les fesses de son amante et a couvert son dos de baisers nombreux.

IV.

Trois fois heureux, André, lorsque tu vis, nue, Aglaé aux seins de rose, aux fesses brillantes! quel délire fut le tien! Et dans les nombreuses unions de l'amour qui agite les flancs, comme tes mains, ta poitrine et tes lèvres ont tressailli de bonheur! Et maintenant encore, après avoir dessiné la belle qui soupire doucement, tu sens déjà en la regardant tes esprits surexcités par le désir?

V.

C'est mon — et non mes mains qui a dessiné cette image.

Ces sentiments, ces rencontres, amours fortuites sans doute et passagères, n'empêchèrent pas Chénier d'éprouver à la même époque un

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

sentiment profond pour Mrs Maria Cosway et de la fréquenter assidument. C'est à elle que sont adressés les vers italiens dont je parlais plus haut et dont voici la traduction.

A la louange de Mrs. Cosway.

Pall Mall, Londres.

La Seine et la Tamise, ces deux sœurs, s'unissent enfin pour admirer la fille de l'Arno, à qui le Phébus toscan donna une lyre d'or, à qui Apelle légua ce vivant pinceau qui fait respirer la toile ; dont le chant est doux, et dont la main savante se promène sur le clavecin ou sur les cordes sonores. Tu es agréée des Muses, ô Cosway, aimée sur le Pinde, chère à la Seine et chère à la Tamise.

Ce poème de huit vers porte en tête 'Pall-Mall, London.' Cette suscription n'est pas de la main de l'auteur. Mais le serait-elle, qu'aucune des indications qui restent sur les adresses de Chénier à Londres, ne peut nous faire supposer qu'il ait jamais habité Pall Mall. C'était à cette époque comme maintenant un quartier beaucoup trop mondain et recherché pour que Chénier, pauvre, puisse y demeurer. Par contre, c'est dans Pall Mall et plus précisément à Schomberg House que Mrs Cosway et son mari, le célèbre miniaturiste, célèbre par son talent et par ses excentricités, habitaient depuis quelques années.

Ils avaient quitté Berkeley Square vers 1782, quelque temps après leur mariage et vivaient à Schomberg House dans le faste et l'opulence. C'est là que Mrs Cosway donnait, particulièrement le dimanche, des soirées musicales qui furent les réunions mondaines les plus suivies de l'époque. On trouve, dans une lettre de Walpole datée du 28 octobre 1787, une expression qui montre la vogue de ces rendez-vous...'By the representatives,' dit Walpole, 'of all the Princes of Europe at Mrs Cosway's diet.'

Ces soirs-là Pall Mall était encombré de voitures, de chaises à porteurs, de porteurs de flambeaux, de laquais. Toute personne connue dans le monde se frayait un chemin à ces réceptions. Horace Walpole les suivait assidument, aussi la Duchesse de Devonshire, Mrs Dawson Damer, sculpteur, la comtesse d'Aylesbury, le Marquis de Townshend, Lady Cecilia Johnstone, Lord Sandys, Earl Cowper, Lord Erskine et beaucoup d'autres trop nombreux pour pouvoir être énumérés ici.

Au milieu de tout ce monde assemblé dans des salles somptueusement meublées, paradait le mari, petit, vieux, habillé toujours à l'extrême dernière mode, faisant sa cour aux femmes, faisant courbettes sur courbettes, recevant la noblesse d'Angleterre avec des airs de prince.

Mrs Cosway avait 28 ans à l'époque. Les écrits du temps la décrivent comme une femme aux cheveux d'or, aux grands yeux bleus, à l'air languissant, généreuse sans affectation, douée de remarquables

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

talents, surtout en musique. Autour d'elle papillotaient le Prince de Galles—qui venait généralement par une petite porte secrète mitoyenne entre son palais et Schomberg House et qui lui faisait une cour assidue—, Marchesi, le chanteur, qui fit un voyage avec elle sur le continent, le pianiste J. L. Dussek et Vincent Lunardi, le secrétaire de l'ambassadeur de Naples.

C'est là que fréquentait Chénier. N'en aurions-nous pas d'autres preuves, nous aurions la lettre que le peintre David adressait de Paris à Mrs Cosway. Il s'excusait dans cette lettre de ne pas avoir encore répondu à Mrs Cosway et il ajoutait: 'C'est parce que je me connais paresseux que je pardonne à Monsieur Saint-André (c'est le nom que portait André Chénier) de ce qu'il ne m'écrit pas; j'espère qu'un jour il lui prendra le même remords qu'à moi. Dites lui bien des choses de ma part et combien je regrette de ne plus le voir. La maison de Monsieur Trudaine est triste depuis qu'il n'y est plus.'

Le peintre David avait été le premier lien qui avait réuni André Chénier et Mrs Cosway. Elle avait rencontré Chénier en 1785 ou 86 pendant un voyage qu'elle faisait à Paris avec son mari, et l'enthousiasme et l'admiration sans bornes qu'ils ressentaient tous deux pour les œuvres de David fut le début de leurs relations.

Pendant ce voyage à Paris, Mrs Cosway avait de 26 à 27 ans et avait déjà eu une vie mouvementée. Elle était née à Florence de parents irlandais qui tenaient sur le lung'Arno une grande pension de famille. Elle était venue en Angleterre après la mort de son père, avec quelques connaissances de dessin, de musique, de cinq ou six langues vivantes. Quand l'argent qu'elle avait apporté avec elle fut à sa fin, poussée surtout vers le besoin, elle épousa Cosway, de 17 ans plus âgé qu'elle, qui l'adorait, qui toujours l'adora. Après une vie plus agitée encore, après la mort de sa fille unique, après celle de son mari, elle devait devenir mère supérieure à Milan d'une maison religieuse de l'ordre des 'Dame Inglesi,' institution dévouée à la cause de l'éducation des jeunes filles. Elle devait recevoir de l'empereur François I^{er} le titre de Baronne de l'empire comme récompense de son travail. Et quand elle mourut à l'âge de 79 ans, sa mort fut considérée comme un malheur public à Lodi et à Milan. Ses funérailles furent suivies de représentants de la famille Impériale.

Les premiers vers que lui envoya Chénier datent de son voyage à Paris pendant l'hiver 1785–86. Tantôt les vers sont explicitement dédiés à Mrs Maria Cosway, qu'il appelle 'jeune Florentine' ou 'la belle insulaire' ou plus clairement encore 'la fille d'Arno.' Parfois aussi

Digitized by Google

Original from
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Chénier a cherché à dérober son nom à la curiosité des lecteurs en la désignant par les lettres D.R. ou D.R.N. qui sont des abréviations pour *d'Erin* ou *d'Arno*.

La présence de Mrs Cosway à Londres pendant le séjour de Chénier à Londres ne fut point pour le poète une source de bonheur. Nous avons déjà vu les sentiments que devait éprouver Chénier parmi les aristocrates qui se réunissaient à Schomberg House. De plus, à ces réunions, Mrs Cosway, au grand désespoir de Chénier, était entourée de nombreux adorateurs. Enfin, dans ses relations avec elle, Chénier fut seul à aimer. Son sentiment qui avait commencé par de l'admiration, puis s'était fait plus tendre pour devenir un mélange d'amour et de respect, ne fut pas payé de retour.

> Que ne puis-je à mon tour, Ah ! que ne puis-je croire
> Que loin d'elle toujours j'occupe sa mémoire !

Cet amour malheureux augmenta encore la tristesse de Chénier à Londres. Il envoyait à ses amis de Paris des appels désespérés. La Comtesse d'Alfieri, peu psychologue ou plus au courant de l'appétit de Chénier que de ce qui se passait dans son cœur, lui répondait : 'Je crois que vos maux viennent de trop manger. Vous êtes gourmand : l'ambassadeur fait bonne chère, vous êtes faible, vous vous y livrez : de là dérivent tous les petits maux et les grandes mélancolies dont vous souffrez.' Chénier pendant ce temps, le cœur plein d'envie, 'ruminant du fiel' comme il dit, jetait sur un morceau de papier quelconque, au dos d'une lettre : 'J'ai été à un bal où toutes ces belles anglaises...Je les regardais sans rien dire...Je portais envie à ceux à qui elles parlaient et de la main de qui elles acceptaient des oranges, des glaces....'

Pendant les deux premières années de son séjour à Londres (1787–88) Chénier fit de fréquents voyages à Paris. Ces voyages devinrent de plus en plus fréquents, si bien qu'il résida bientôt autant à Paris qu'à Londres, puis plus à Paris qu'à Londres. Dès l'été de 1790, Chénier qui ne devait résigner son poste qu'au commencement de 1791, cessa complètement d'habiter Londres. L'ambassadeur Marquis de la Luzerne donna sa démission pour raison de santé à cette époque. André, qui était simplement attaché à sa personne, n'avait plus de raison de demeurer en Angleterre. Déjà il s'était fait admettre dans la société de 1789 qui s'était fondée au mois de mai et de juin. En rentrant d'Angleterre, il descendit chez son père, qui demeurait alors 24 rue du Sentier, et s'engagea dans les luttes politiques.

La *Revue de Paris* publia dans un numéro de 1830 le souvenir que Chénier avait gardé de l'Angleterre. Il est extrêmement amusant.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

J'ai habité parmi ces anglais.....Français, votre jeunesse n'apprend rien de bon chez eux...qu'à faire courir des chevaux, des paris ruineux...un jeu ! Laissons là les anglais.

Laissons leur jeunesse..... mélancolique
Au sortir du gymnase, ignorante et rustique,
De contrée en contrée aller au monde entier
Offrir sa joie ignoble et son faste grossier ;
Promener son ennui, ses travers, ses caprices ;
A ses vices, partout, ajouter d'autres vices ;
Et présenter aux ris du public indulgent
Son insolent orgueil fondé sur son argent.

Si on omet un passage qui fut publié plus tard et où Chénier faisait dans une très courte phrase l'éloge de la Constitution anglaise, c'était là tout le souvenir que Chénier rapportait de l'Angleterre. Quelques travers, particuliers d'ailleurs à une infime minorité, avaient attiré et retenu son attention. Les grandes qualités de cette grande nation, que toute l'Europe quelques années plus tard devait prendre comme modèle, lui avaient complètement échappé. Il avait été aveugle aux beautés de la poésie anglaise comme à la grandeur du caractère anglais, faisant preuve d'une injustice et d'une incompréhension totale dont nous rougissons presque à l'heure actuelle et dont il faut nous hâter de rire de peur d'être obligé d'en pleurer.

René P. Legros.
London.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

ITALIAN AND ENGLISH PASTORAL DRAMA OF THE RENAISSANCE

III.

Sources of Daniel's 'Queen's Arcadia' and Randolph's 'Amyntas.'

In their own day the *Aminta* and the *Pastor Fido* were, without doubt, the best known of pastoral plays. But in an age in which a strong link bound together in close contact men of letters in England and Italy, it is only reasonable to assume that other pastorals, which delighted the courts of Italy, may also have reached England, even though the precise record of them has perished. In former articles it has been shown that the *Egle* of Giraldi Cintio and the *Giuditio di Paride* of Anello Paulilli, plays widely different in type, were known in England. No step forward can be made in the study of the Elizabethan pastoral drama until it can be ascertained exactly which Italian pastorals were known to English playwrights, exactly what material was re-handled by them, and thence can be discovered how far literary men, who show themselves fully acquainted with the most minute details of the pastoral convention as it was evolved in Italy, were expressing a new phase of their own life, or merely, in a spirit of emulation, indulging in an intellectual exercise.

The first avowed attempt to reproduce the conventional Italian pastoral drama on the English stage was made in 1605 by Samuel Daniel. The *Queen's Arcadia* seems at first sight to be composed of scenes introducing motives which were the common property of classical students. The whole play is indeed but a jumble of borrowed episodes, strung together by melodious verse; but it is a mistake to believe that Daniel wandered at will indiscriminately culling gems from the classics and drawing inspiration from motives common to pastoral poetry. On the contrary, his method of borrowing is precise and deliberate. The same poet who exclaims in his *Cleopatra*:

> O that the Ocean did not bound our stile,
> Within these strict and narrow limites so:
> But that the melodie of our sweete Ile,
> Might now be heard to Tyber, Arne and Po
> That they might know how far Thames doth out-go
> The Musicke of declined Italy.....

nevertheless did not disdain to ornament his own works with the verse

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

of the poets he so scorns. His scenes are carefully selected from the plays of Tasso, Guarini and Luigi Groto.

The story of the *Queen's Arcadia* revolves around the rival lovers of Cloris, Carinus and Amyntas. Act I, sc. 2 gives a lively picture of the two shepherds wrangling as to the claim of each to call himself beloved by the nymph.

Carinus. Now fond Amyntas, how cam'st thou possest
With such a vaine presumption, as thou art,
To thinke that Cloris should affect thee best
When all Arcadia knowes I have her heart?

Not only is the general trend of this episode borrowed from an Italian pastoral—the whole scene is in reality translated word for word and transplanted bodily from Luigi Groto's *Pentimento Amoroso* (1575). This play opens with a scene between the shepherds Nicogino and Ergasto, rival lovers of Dieromena. Nicogino, hearing Ergasto sing the praises of the nymph, springs out demanding

Non sei chiaro chiarissimo
Che ama sol me, non altri?.....

It will be enlightening to compare the two versions.

Groto, *Pentimento Amoroso*, I, 1.

Nic.
Non sei chiaro chiarissimo
Che ama sol me, non altri?
Erg.
E d' onde cavitu
Un fondamento sì certo?
Nic.
Da i proprii
Effetti che mi dan più chiaro inditio
De l' amor suo di giorno in giorno.
Erg.
Habbiamone
Noi anchora.
Nic.
Se ne hai: non son già simili
A' miei.
Erg.
Facciamo un patto: ciascun reciti
Quei signali, per cui si crede d' essere
Più amato, e chi a men, senza contendere,
Ceda a l' altro.
Nic.
Mi piace.
Erg.
Sii tu il primo di
Dir.

Daniel, *Queen's Arcadia*, I, 2.

Carinus.
Now fond Amyntas, how cam'st thou possest
With such a vaine presumption, as thou art,
To thinke that Cloris should affect thee best
When all Arcadia knowes I have her heart?
Amyntas.
And how Carinus canst thou be so mad,
T'imagine Cloris can, or doth love thee,
When by so many signes as I have had,
I find her whole affection bent to me?
Carinus.
What are those signes by which you come to cast,
And calculate the fortune of your hopes?
Amyntas.
More certaine signes then thou canst ever shew.
Carinus.
But they are more then signes that I can shew.
Amyntas.
Why let each then produce the best he can,
To prove which may be thought the likeliest man.
Carinus.
Content—Amyntas, and do thou begin.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Nic.
Di gratia : costei quando mi nomina
Si tinge in viso d' un vermiglio, simile
A quel di cui tal' hor la luna è solita
Tingersi quando venti ne pronostica.

Erg.
Così costei al' hora a te pronostica.
Sospir nel nominarti e quello accendersi
In viso (a mio parere) è segno d' odio....

Nic.
Se'n qualche riva ella s'abbate a colgere
Fiori con altre Ninfe ; e ivi subito
Mi scopre comparir, resta sì attonita
E senza forza, che non ricordandosi
All'hor di se, lascia cader giù il lembo de
La vesta, si che i fior tutti si versono
E' l capo in sen s' asconde.

Erg.
Ancho la pecora,
Vedendo il lupo, si scorda di pascere.....

Nic.
Da poi s' avien, ch' ella si lavi gli' homeri
Ad una fonte, o il viso, o il crin, miran-
domi
Quivi, e fingendo di non farlo a dedita
Opra, mi spruzza di quelle acque.

Erg.
Spengere
Vuole il tuo foco : o mostrarti, che
simile
È l' amor, che ti porta, a quel che Delia
Portava ad Attheon.....

Nic.
Mentre una pastorella mia domestica
Le stringea un giorno al braccio manco
un cerchio di
Sette herbe sacre e colte contra il fascino,
Sentì (come da poi mi disse) a un subito
Mio comparir saltarle in moto vario
Da quel di prima, e più spesso del solito
Quella parte del braccio, che va a
giungersi
Con la mano.

Amyntas.
And I am well contented to begin.
First if by chance, whil'st she at Barley-
breake
With other Nymphes, do but perceive
me come,
Streight lookes her cheeke with such a
Rosie red,
As gives the setting Sume unto the
West
When morrow tempests are prefigured.

Carinus.
Even so that hew prognosticates her
wrath,
Which brings to thee the stormy windes
of sighes.

Amyntas.
And if I finde her with her fellow
Nymphes
Gathering of flowers by some sweet
Rivers side,
At my approach she straight way stands
upright,
Forgets her worke, and downe lets slide
her lap,
And out fall all her flowers, upon the
ground.

Carinus.
So doth the silly sheepe forget to feed,
When it perceives the greedy wolfe at
hand.....

Amyntas.
Whilst at a Chrystall spring the other
day,
She washt her lovely face, and seeing me
come,
She takes up water with her dainty hand,
And with a downe-cast looke besprinckles
me.

Carinus.
That shewes that shee would gladly
quench in thee
The fire of love, or else like love doth
beare,
As did the Delian Goddesse, when she
cast
Disdainefull water on Acteons face.

Amyntas.
As Silvia, one day, sate with her alone,
Binding of certaine choice selected
hearbes,
To her left arme, against bewitching
spels,
(And I at the instant comming) shee per-
ceiv'd
Her pulse with farre more violence to
beat
(As sh'after told me) then it did before.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Erg.
Ne avviene ancho il medesimo
Quando febre nemica a noi s'approssima.....

Carinus.
The like is felt when natures enemy,
The hatefull feaver, doth surprise our powers.....

In both plays the same reasons are adduced to prove the love of the nymph and all are derided by the rival. The exasperated lover finally demands the other's proofs and finds himself tricked.

Nic.
Se non ama me, ama te?

Erg.
Senza dubbio.

Nic.
Dunque, secondo i nostri patti, reciti
Quei signali anchor tu, che te'l fan credere.

Erg.
O goffo, hor veggio ben, che tu sei sempio
Senza cervel, se credi, ch'io ti pubblichi
I secreti tra lei, e me.

Amyntas.
Now friend Carinus, thou that mutterest so
At these plaine speaking figures of her love,
Tell by what signes thou doest her favours prove?

Carinus.
Now silly man, doest thou imagine me
So fond to blab the favours of my love?

Amyntas.
Was't not a pact agreed twixt thee and me?

Carinus.
A pact to make thee tell thy secrecy.

Amyntas.
And hast thou then betrayd my easie trust,
And dallied with my open simplenesse?

Carinus.
And fitly art thou serv'd, that so wilt vaunt
The imagin'd favours of a gentle Nymph.....

Nicogino's claim to the love of Dieromena is based on the fact that he has saved her from a satyr:

andando vidi un Satiro
Che haveva preso a un laccio una vaghissima
Ninfa e quest' era quella Dieromena... (*Pent. Am.*, I, 2.)

Carinus' claim to the love of Cloris is based on the same proof of fidelity. Daniel also borrows the name Nicogino, which in Groto's play is evidently given to the victorious rival because of its significance, and gives it to the father of Colax whom he names 'Nicoginus of the hill.'

Although Daniel can claim no originality in this scene, he does nevertheless prove himself to be a poet of great sweetness, for his flowing and musical lines seem even more graceful when placed side by side with the harshness and stiff monotony of Groto's 'endecasillabi sdruccioli.'

It should be noted that this scene of Groto has also served as a model for a French poet. Quinault in *La Comédie sans Comédie*, II, sc. 4, has an exactly corresponding scene between the two lovers Filène and Dafnis, who quarrel over the nymph Clomire.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

This is not the only episode Daniel borrowed from the Italian, though he did not always go so far as to translate them word for word. In Act II, sc. 1, Colax the mischief maker tells Silvia that Palaemon is untrue to her and is courting Nisa, a 'base trull.' He then warns Palaemon that Silvia is in love with

> base Thirsis, that wild hare-braine youth
> Whom every milk-maid in Arcadia skornes.

This trick of the jealous Colax is none other than that played by Corisca, the false nymph of Guarini's *Pastor Fido*. In Act III, scenes 5 and 6, she tells Amarilli that Silvio is in love with Lisetta and warns Mirtillo that Amarilli loves Coridone, a mere goatherd.

In recounting to Cloris the deception of Palaemon, Silvia laments her loss in much the same terms as Dieromena of the *Pentimento Amoroso*, III, laments Nicogino's deception. In the same scene in which Silvia describes how she first felt the awakening of love for Palaemon, when he was about to fling himself from a rock, Daniel is obviously drawing his inspiration from the final scene of the *Aminta*.

In Act II, sc. 2, we find the wiles of the false nymph Techne fully revealed. She pleads with Cloris on behalf of Colax, just as Corisca (*Pastor Fido*, III, 6) pleads with Amarilli for Mirtillo and arranges a meeting which is to end in no good. Then follows a bitter denunciation of women by Palaemon who now believes in the inconstancy of Silvia:

> Trust women ? ah Mirtillus rather trust
> The Summer windes, th' oceans constancy,

which is so obviously derived from the vituperations of the satyr in *Aminta*, II, 1, and *Pastor Fido*, I, 5, that it is hardly in need of comment. So also the scene in Act III, sc. 4, when Techne induces Amyntas to watch the cave of Erycina whence Cloris later emerges followed by Colax. This is the same trick played by Ergasto on Dieromena, when he induces her to watch Nicogino's meeting with Filovevia and convinces her of his falsity (*Pent. Am.*, III, 6). Again it appears in the *Pastor Fido*, III, 6, when Corisca arranges for Mirtillo to witness the damning sight of Amarilli entering the 'Antro d'Ericina' where Coridone is said to be awaiting her.

Again in Act IV, 1, when Techne makes love in froward manner to Amyntas, we are forcibly reminded of Corisca's advances to Mirtillo. In each case the desperate shepherd decides on suicide, Amyntas rushing away at once to kill himself. In Act IV, 3, Techne brings news to Cloris of Amyntas' intended suicide. Cloris follows him and his weak state moves her to love him, just as in *Aminta*, V, 1, Daphne brings news of

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Aminta's desperation and attempted suicide, and Silvia follows and is moved to love.

The scene (v, 1) in which Amarillis plays with Carinus' dog, and is repulsed by the shepherd, is reminiscent of the *Pentimento Amoroso*, III, 4, where Filovevia is a nymph of the same type, but disdained by the shepherd Ergasto. Again in the *Pastor Fido*, II, 2, Dorinda caresses Silvio's dog, Melampo, and even abducts him to cause Silvio to follow her, but fails to move the shepherd to love her.

The *Queen's Arcadia*, with its obvious imitation of these three Italian plays, does then represent a culminating point in the evolution of the pastoral convention. In it can be seen a definite attempt of an English poet to acclimatise the pastoral convention as known in Italy. It will have been noticed however that Daniel draws his episodes equally from the *Pentimento Amoroso* of Luigi Groto, as from the *Aminta* and the *Pastor Fido*. Groto, the 'Cieco d' Adria,' undoubtedly enjoyed a reputation in England not much inferior to that of Tasso and Guarini. In fact, Ben Jonson[1] testifies to his importance:

> Which of your poets? Petrarch, or Tasso, or Dante?
> Guarini? Ariosto? Aretine?
> Cieco di Hadria? I have read them all.

His plays seem to have been well known in England. His tragedy *Dalida* was produced at Trinity College, Cambridge, in a Latin version *Roxana* between 1583 and 1592[2].

A further proof that the *Pentimento Amoroso* itself was known and appreciated in England is offered by the fact that a Latin version was performed at Cambridge under the title of *Parthenia* some time before 1600[3]. The unknown translator of the *Pentimento Amoroso* further conceals the real origin of the play by changing the names of the characters: thus, 'Nicogino pastore' becomes Phyllissides, Ergasto becomes Amyntas, Dieromena becomes Parthenia, Panurgia and Filovevia are replaced by Blandina and Lycetta, 'Menfestio pastore' by Elpino, and 'Melibeo capraio' by Clonicus. The situations remain identical. In the first act, Phyllissides and Amyntas reveal themselves as rivals for the love of Parthenia, and the rest of the play follows closely the plot of the *Pentimento Amoroso*. Important additions however have been made. A new personage is introduced, one 'Cacus Latro' who steals necklaces, disguises himself as a Turk, is tricked by a nymph and is finally brought up to judgment before Pan. In the final scene it is

[1] *Volpone*, III, 3.
[2] *Jahrbuch der deutschen Shakespeare-Gesellschaft*, XXXIV, Weimar, 1898.
[3] The MS. is now preserved in Emmanuel Coll., Cambridge.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

revealed that he is an exile from Corinth, whose king he declares to be the father of one of the nymphs, Blandina. Whereupon he is pardoned and the play ends happily with a general chorus of:

Holla whoope, Holla whoope !
Jam laetis resonent undique vocibus
Campi, montes et nemora,
Plaususque festis et solennes edite et Plaudite.

This romantic recognition of Blandina (Filovevia) does not occur in Groto's play, nor is there any counterpart for Cacus, who comports himself in much the same manner as the traditional satyr[1], or even more so, as the peasant-thief introduced in the rustic show to add a burlesque element. There is in fact a 'Favola Pastorale' composed by il Desioso, Academico Insipido Sanese, entitled *Il Ladro Cacco* (published in 1583), in which the unscrupulous 'villano' Cacco plays a precisely similar part.

The influence of Luigi Groto is also to be traced in the much discussed *Mayde's Metamorphosis*, an anonymous play printed in 1600 and therefore earlier than the *Queen's Arcadia*. It combines pastoral and mythological elements and, though in spirit at least, it bears some resemblance to the *Arraignment of Paris*, it is distinguished by an additional feature, the court or romantic element.

The Duke Telemachus, in order to prevent his son Ascanio from marrying a maid of obscure birth, gives orders to two of his courtiers to lead her secretly into the wood and to kill her. Phylander and Orestes, under the pretence of telling her a tale, recount their errand to Eurymine on the way, and finally reveal that she herself is the victim. Her tears and prayers move Phylander to pity, and instead of killing her, they bid her dwell for ever in the woods and never return to the court, while they take back with them, in order to prove her death, a kid's heart and a piece of lawn that she was wearing. This episode has its counterpart in Groto's *Pentimento Amoroso*, IV, 3, where Ergasto orders his servant Melibeo to lead Filovevia into the woods and there to kill her. Melibeo however gives way to pity at the tears of the girl, and after extracting a promise that she will live henceforth in the wilds of the forest, he dips his knife in the blood of a goat and goes back to Ergasto. Both Eurymine and Filovevia return home in the end and their reappearance causes general rejoicing.

Again a second episode in the *Mayde's Metamorphosis* seems to point

[1] Cf. Sannazaro, *Arcadia*, ed. Scherillo, p. 108 :
Quel che la nocte veglia e 'l gallicinio
Gli è primo sonno, e tutti Caccho il chiamano
Però che vive sol di latrocinio.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

to the influence of another of Groto's plays—the *Calisto*, a mythological pastoral published in 1583 but first played in 1561. In this play Giove takes on the form of Diana, and Mercurio that of Isse, a nymph of Diana, and their change of sex and identity causes the same confusion as the change in the *Mayde's Metamorphosis*, where Eurymine is transformed from maid to man and back again. Of course it is possible that the author of the English play may have drawn his inspiration for this turn of the play direct from Ovid, or even from Lyly's *Gallathea*, but the resemblance is worthy of notice in view of the possibility of his being already acquainted with Groto's works. In the same way his use of the name Gemulo is noteworthy, for it is a somewhat unusual name, but appears in the *Calisto*.

The influence of the *Pentimento Amoroso* is seen even more clearly in a later play, by Thomas Randolph, *Amyntas or the Impossible Dowry*, first printed in 1638. In Groto's play, Act I, sc. 4, Dierǫmena, driven to give some answer to the rival lovers, takes Ergasto's garland and gives her own to Nicogino. She then goes out leaving each one convinced of his own triumph. The same scene occurs in *Amyntas*, II, 6, where Laurinda 'takes Damon's garland and wears it, placing her own on Alexis':

> Damon, as I affect thee, so I vow
> To wear this garland that adorns thy brow:
> This wreath of flowers Alexis, which was mine,
> Because thou lov'st me truly, shall be thine—
> This is plain dealing: let not Cupid's wars
> Drive your affections to uncivil jars.

The situation here is rendered even more cruel by the fact that Damon and Alexis were originally great friends before they had the misfortune to fall in love with Laurinda. Randolph exaggerates the difficulty of the position by making Laurinda far more wavering than the original Dieromena[1], for she gives several equivocal answers of the same type, leaving even her final choice to be decided by chance.

Here ends the influence of the *Pentimento Amoroso*. But Randolph's play, though showing much more novelty in conception and execution than the majority of English pastorals, does yet owe much to the

[1] This scene of the *Pentimento Amoroso* also served as a model for a second scene of Quinault's *La Comédie sans Comédie*, II, 6, when Filène and Dafnis refer their quarrel to Clomire and where the same perplexity results. The motive of the two garlands was probably borrowed by Groto from the first 'questione d' amore' in Boccaccio's *Filocolo* (Libro v). There is a considerable literature on the subject. Cf. A. Gaspary, *Storia della Letteratura Italiana*, II (tr. Rossi), i, p. 326; P. Rajna in *Romania*, XXXI (1902), p. 36, and in *Raccolta di studi critici dedicata ad A. d'Ancona* (1901), pp. 557–68; also T. F. Crane, *Italian Social Customs of the Sixteenth Century* (New Haven, Yale Univ. Press, 1920), p. 68 *n*.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Italian. Amyntas is in love with Urania, daughter of Claius, who is under a curse. On behalf of Amyntas, Pilumnus, Urania's grandfather, consults the oracle as to the advisability of the match and about his child's dowry and receives the astounding answer:

> That which thou hast not, mayst not, canst not have,
> Amyntas, is the dowry that I crave.
> Rest hopeless in thy love, or else divine
> To give Urania this, and she is thine.

It is not surprising that Amyntas should lose his wits in trying to solve the riddle.

This ingenious answer on which the whole of the play turns, is not a creation of Randolph's. It had already gone to form a striking episode in a 'favola pastorale' of Giovanni Donato Cuccheti, whose *La Pazzia* 1581 (Ferrara) is so named because the shepherd Fileno goes mad for love of Alteria who scorns him. But while Fileno is still in his senses, Metio comes to him lamenting his nymph Serpilia's disdainful reply:

> Metio, non ti pensar godermi mai,
> Se prima non mi doni quella cosa,
> Che mai tu non l' havesti, e meno hor l' hai ;
> Nè sei per mai haverla in alcun tempo ;
> Nè sperar più l' udir da me parola
> Fin che non me l' arrechi.....

A hard saying indeed, but one which finds a solution. Fileno wisely explains:

> Sappi, Metio, Serpilia altro non chiede
> Ch' esserti moglie ; hor vedi s' ella t' ama
> Altro da te non vuol se non marito.

In the same way the perplexity of Amyntas is dispelled, in a scene when all seemed lost and the dowry indeed impossible, by the answer of Echo:

> How shall I pay the dowry, that you ask me?
> *Echo.* Ask me.
> I ask a dowry to be made a husband.
> *Echo.* A husband.
> Answer directly to what I said last.
> *Echo.* What I said last.
> A husband, Ceres? Why is that the guess?
> *Echo.* Yes.

The fact of Randolph's having drawn his inspiration from definite Italian plays, instead of from motives which were acknowledged to be common property, does not in any way detract from the merit of his play. It will always remain one of the most interesting attempts to create a pastoral play in which real mirth and wit should have their share. Nevertheless the acknowledgment of the debt of Daniel and of Randolph has its importance in a study of the fortunes of the Italian pastoral convention in England. To the list of Italian pastorals known

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

to English playwrights must now be added the names of Luigi Groto and Giovanni Donato Cuccheti, authors of plays which in their own country certainly ranked as second-rate, or even third-rate. This in itself is a significant fact. If plays which were by no means considered masterpieces in their own country were admired and even reproduced in England, it will be realised that Italian taste and culture must have occupied a far higher place in the esteem of English men of letters than has so far been admitted.

V. M. JEFFERY.

LONDON.

Digitized by Google

Original from
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

THE LITERARY ACTIVITIES OF THE SPANISH 'EMIGRADOS' IN ENGLAND.

(1814–1834)

II.

PERHAPS the best known of all the periodicals published by the exiles is the *Ocios de Españoles emigrados*, a monthly journal which lasted nearly four years (1824–7) and was inspired by a desire to spread a knowledge of Spanish culture in England as a return for the kindness which the literary men among the emigrants had received there[1]. Its principal concerns, as expressed in the Prologue to Volume I, are literature, politics and economics: its literary aims, however, are not primarily creative but rather informative. 'En cuanto a la literatura, se hablará de su progreso y decadencia, así en épocas generales, como en cortos períodos; de los literatos poco conocidos...(y) de sus obras[2].' Apart from printing a few patriotic poems[3], the journal lives up to its aims, and even such literary matter as there is takes a very low place compared with politics. Purely historical articles are also included. There is a fair proportion of attention paid to Spanish America[4], chiefly manifesting itself in chronicles and semi-commercial articles, with occasional humanistic contributions and reviews of books. Worthy of note also are several translations and imitations from the English: a translation of Cowper's *Ode to Peace* (III, pp. 487–8); an imitation of Moore's '*What the bee is to the floweret*' (VI, p. 85); an imitation of Coleridge (*Something childish but very natural*) (VI, pp. 86–7); and a translation by 'P. P. O.' of some English 'Serenade,' the original of which I do not know (V, pp. 448–9).

[1] *Prólogo*, p. 1: 'En el prospecto de este periódico anunciamos los motivos que nos mueven a su publicación, es a saber, la correspondencia a la buena acogida literaria que experimentamos en la nación Británica, y el deseo de aumentar entre sus individuos el conocimiento de las cosas Españolas, contribuyendo con lo que podemos a la gloria de nuestra patria en un tiempo en que procuran eclipsarla tantos enemigos extraños y domésticos.'

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 4.

[3] A notable example is the *Desterrado* (II, p. 60) mentioned above, signed 'A. de S.' and headed 'Nos apresuramos a publicar la siguiente composición de un emigrado español, bien conocido en el mundo literario por sus producciones poéticas.' Part of a translation into English heroic couplets by 'B. Read' is given in II, p. 446, Saavedra still figuring as 'A. de S.'

[4] II, pp. 209–21, *Rápida ojeada sobre la república de Colombia*; III, pp. 341–6, *Chile*; III, pp. 415–9, *Buenos Aires*; III, pp. 517–23, *Méjico*; IV, pp. 141–8, *Perú*; IV, pp. 293–305, *Hispano-América*; V, pp. 98–112 (various) and a large number of minor notices from the different republics.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

These no doubt were intended to make English literature known in Spain, but it is not surprising to find that in 1825 Fernando VII forbade its importation as being a journal both 'alarmante y subversivo[1].'

Passing over the numerous informative articles—on Bibliography, translations of the Bible, manuscripts, and the like—we may more profitably consider those passages which betray the literary point of view of the writers. Their articles on earlier literature being so full of (very natural) hatred of intolerance[2], it is equally natural that their ideas on contemporary literature should be coloured by the same feelings. We find then in a summary of literature since 1808 (I, pp. 97–103 ff.) the most made of such literature as the years from 1808 to 1814 produced[3]; the period 1814–20 (I, pp. 193–204) is described as more baneful for letters than that of the War and one of complete desolation; the years 1820–3 on the other hand are years of plenty. The *emigrados* are pictured (I, p. 293) as bringing their sheaves (of work written during the exile) with them and various minor works published at the time are adduced to support the thesis. The only one of these which has survived a hundred years is Saavedra's *Lanuza*, and this is seldom read![4]

A later article entitled *Rasgo apologético sobre la literatura española* (III, pp. 146–52, 233 ff.) suggests at its opening a rather truer appreciation of the state of Spanish literature. 'Las producciones con que se honra la lengua castellana empiezan a recobrar aquella alta estimación que en el siglo XVI las hacía mirar como modelos en el orbe literario.' But there is nothing more to suggest a prevision of coming glories, and a lengthy review of Moratín's plays in a new edition (III, pp. 300 ff.) makes it clear that the writer (if it is the same man) is referring to the Salamancan School. A long and eulogistic article on Nicolás Fernández de Moratín (IV, pp. 97–111) confirms this impression: the 'especie de restablecimiento' dates from the eighteenth century and N. F. de Moratín is 'quizá el que más ha contribuido en días inmediatos a los nuestros a restaurar el gusto de las bellas letras en España, no sólo con los preceptos, sino también con el ejemplo práctico de muchas producciones dramáticas, líricas y polémicas' (IV, p. 100. Cf. VII, p. 381).

[1] See IV, pp. 289–91.

[2] E.g. I, pp. 134–8: *Persecución literaria*; II, pp. 16–21: *Contraste etc.*; II, pp. 140–5: *De varios literatos etc.*; II, pp. 236–40: *Persecución del cristianismo por el clero de España.*

[3] The strength and the weakness of the position are summed up in the words (p. 100) 'La naturaleza que daba impulso a los brazos para la pelea, como maestra de la buena poesía movió también las lenguas y las plumas de los que ya la cultivaban, y crió otros de nuevo, que nunca sin esta ocasión hubieran sido dignos del Parnaso.'

[4] P. 294: '¿No vieron ellos [los literatos] con sus ojos el impulso que recibió el gusto de la poesía dramática, y cómo en los teatros aquel pueblo creído bárbaro supo discernir y celebrar con aplauso las verdaderas bellezas del *Lanuza*, tragedia del joven Saavedra, y las de otras muchas composiciones?'

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

A favourable notice of Heredia's poetry (IV, pp. 516–20) remarks on his indebtedness to 'las últimas impresiones, ya el tinte melancólico y severo de Mr. La Martine, ya el tono lastimero y profundamente tierno de Chenier, ya el vuelo atrevido aunque algo penoso de Casimiro de La Vigne' (IV, p. 517) but makes no mention of the movement which was fast gathering strength in France and ten years later was to invade Spain in force. On the other hand, the patriotic element in literature which so powerfully contributed to Spanish Romanticism is everywhere apparent. Böhl de Faber's *Floresta de Rimas Antiguas Castellanas* (Hamburg, 1821) receives a review of no less than twenty pages which concludes with the earnest exhortation to present and future poets to study their own literature. And the two volumes of Maury's *Espagne poétique* (Paris, 1826–7), less important to Spain if equally gratifying to her natural pride, are reviewed in the last volume in some twenty-two pages of small print, in two instalments (VII, pp. 97–111, 376–82)[1].

Variedades o el Mensajero de Londres appeared in 1824 and 1825[2] under the editorship of Blanco White. It would seem from the title-page as if the editor were the sole author of Vol. I, and though in Vol. II we find '*dirigido* por...' for 'por,' the concluding article is markedly personal in tone. In a note at Vol. II, p. 218, the Editor announces that he has taken into collaboration D. Pablo Mendibil, who will henceforth be responsible for some minor articles.

From the *Advertencia* at the beginning of Vol. I to this valedictory *Despedida del autor de las Variedades a los Hispano-Americanos* (II, pp. 299–311) the Spanish-American side of the journal is strongly emphasised. The former suggests, what we know to be the case, that Ackermann was relying principally on American support; the latter describes Blanco's object as having been to 'hacer revivir la Literatura

[1] Alcalá Galiano's account of the *Ocios* may be given here (*Recuerdos de un anciano*, pp. 525–7; cf., for the other journal mentioned, p. 456 below).

'Dos periódicos, no diarios ni aun semanales, sino publicados a largos plazos, existieron, siendo la vida del uno breve, y la del otro casi igual en lo larga a nuestro destierro.....

Fué el segundo periódico el titulado *Ocios* de españoles emigrados, donde escribieron principalmente D. José Canga Argüelles y D. Joaquín Lorenzo Villanueva. En ninguno de los dos escribí yo, lo cual digo, porque ha sido frecuente creer lo contrario. Una contienda literaria entre el mismo Villanueva y D. N. Puigblanc mostró superioridad de saber en el último, pero empleada en sustentar extravagancias a la par con verdades, haciéndole mucha ventaja como escritor el primero. En una contestación sobre política entre el insigne economista, pero hombre singular, D. Alvaro Florez Estrada y D. José Calatrava, cada uno llevó en mi sentir la palma, pero fué del segundo en materia de estilo. D. Vicente Salvá, dueño de un almacen de librería y ex-diputado, trabajó mucho en el ramo de bibliografía. Lo que otros tal vez hicieron, o no salió a luz, o no llamó la atención a punto de habérseme quedado grabado en la memoria.'

[2] Blanco inadvertently in one place calls the date 1822. Méndez Bejarano (*op. cit.*, p. 383) corrects this to 1823. The date, however, on the title-page of Vol. I is 1824.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Española en Londres, en favor de los Hispano-Americanos[1]' (II, p. 299). It would seem that Ackermann approached Blanco at a time when there were few Spaniards in London, and that he abandoned the task after two years, principally for reasons of health, and partly because of the number of *emigrados* now in London who could carry on the work. In point of fact we have already seen that there were other reasons[2].

We should expect to find a large part of the journal devoted to Spanish-American interests, which is, in fact, the case[3]. We may note an article on the Generalisimo of Venezuela, with which (I, pp. 1–14) the journal starts; a long article on Colombian affairs (I, pp. 86–101); an account of the political constitution of Chile (II, pp. 5–22); and another of the political prospects in Mexico (II, pp. 311–23; cf. II, pp. 100–20). There are further various collections of 'Noticias hispano-americanas,' biographical studies of American celebrities; commercial and other articles from different sources reprinted or summarised under the general heading of *Variedades* or of *El Mensajero* and remarks (notably II, pp. 1–4) on Spanish-American books and periodicals.

The remainder of the journal is largely occupied with generalities, written with the object of conveying interesting information about the world in general or London in particular[4]. There are, however, two classes of literary article which deserve mention.

The first class consists of articles on contemporary and older Spanish literature. Those on earlier times include a reprinted article by Quintana on the Romances (I, pp. 63–71), a sketch of Spanish literature since the

[1] Cf. I, p. 63: 'Se escribe en Inglaterra donde hay personas aficionadas a la lengua castellana, y se dirige principalmente a América, donde trece millones de habitantes la tienen por habla nacional.'

[2] II, p. 300: 'En el época en que el Señor Ackermann me instó a que escribiese para Hispano-América, apenas había otro Español en esta capital que pudiese tomar semejante empresa a su cargo....Ahora que las desgracias de España han poblado a Londres de emigrados españoles, de los quales varios son hombres de grande instrucción y talentos, y algunos viven ya del trabajo de su pluma, no puedo menos que tratar de descansar de la fatiga que me causa la obra que concluirá con este Número.'

[3] Mora (*Correo politico y literario de Buenos Aires*, Aug. 31, 1827) describes it after its decease thus: 'Uno de los periódicos más perfectos que se han publicado jamás en idioma castellano es sin duda el *Mensajero de Londres*, escrito por aquel eminente literato que antes que Mr. De Pradt i ningún otro europeo defendió la causa de la América ante el mundo antiguo, el ilustrado Blanco White. El *Mensajero* ofrece una variedad de doctrina que rivaliza con el acendrado buen gusto que en ella reina, i con el estilo perfecto en que está vertida. Las biografías de algunos hombres tan caros a la América como Bolívar, Morelos, Ramos Arispe, Mina, Canning, Mackintosh i Lansdown, las relaciones mas curiosas de viajes i aventuras, la descripción de los países mas interesantes del globo, el análisis de muchas obras de mérito publicadas recientemente en Europa, ensayos llenos de originalidad i de sensatez sobre las costumbres, las instituciones i la vida doméstica de los ingleses, tales son en jeneral los asuntos que el autor ha tratado con su acostumbrada maestría.'

[4] I cite as examples the series of articles entitled: *Entretenimientos Geográficos*; *Perspectivas de Londres*; *De las Crónicas Antiguas*, the titles of which express sufficiently well their character. The books reviewed are as often miscellaneous as not and the *Variedades* are nearly always so.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Renaissance which is partly a protest against 'intellectual tyranny' and a warning to Spanish America (I, pp. 104–20), some selections from Jorge Manrique, and a short extract from *El Conde Lucanor*. Besides these longer contributions we find also several reviews of classics like the *Celestina*, Lope's *El Testimonio Vengado* and an English translation of Garcilasso. The modern part consists mainly of reviews. A eulogistic account of Alberto Lista's achievements (with the promise of a later article on the Academy of Sevilla) precedes (I, pp. 183–4) two specimens of his work. A review (II, pp. 218–41), with specimens, of Lamartine's *Méditations Poétiques*, Casimir Delavigne's *Messéniennes* and Béranger's *Chansons*, deprecates the imitation of French literature by Spanish-American writers, in spite of the great apparent advantages which it has to them over English. The remainder of the contemporary works noticed, however, are the productions of the 'indefatigable Mr Ackermann'; Moratín's lyric poetry, which is given the highest praise; Mora's *No me olvides*; and works of a not primarily literary character such as a Spanish translation of Paley's *Evidences* and a number of school books.

Considering that in one place (I, p. 379) Blanco gives it out as his chief aim to encourage literature his achievement seems very disappointing. The chief importance of *Variedades*, however, is in its interpretation of English literature to such Spaniards as were able to procure it—mainly of course those in London and America,—during the absolutist *régime* in Spain.

Merely noticing a series of *Cartas sobre Inglaterra* (I, pp. 14, 120, 199, 305, 406; II, pp. 35, 201 ff.) which deal mainly with manners and customs, a number of translations from Shakespeare (I, pp. 74 ff.) and many minor notices and references, we come to a short article (with a coloured plate) on Newstead Abbey which is in effect a eulogy of Byron. Blanco White's warm praise cannot but have played its part in contributing to the vogue of Byron abroad, especially among the *emigrados* in England and France, some of whom were to come under his influence so strongly.

> Si la lengua inglesa y su poesía fuesen más conocidas, que lo son al presente, en donde se habla Castellano, la lámina a que se refiere este artículo atraería los ojos de todos, a pesar de no ser de las más bellas.....Ojalá que los aficionados a la poesía, entre los que hablan Español, pudieran estudiarlo, para que así saliesen del miserable estilo que prevalece en las composiciones de su Parnaso. Allí verían como el pensar profundo se combina con imagenes bellas; y como los sentimientos más delicados se mezclan con las pinturas de objetos exteriores.

More important even than this, are the articles on *Ivanhoe* (II, pp. 174–5) which are almost the first attempt to popularise Scott in

Digitized by Google Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

the Spanish language (I, pp. 31–8, 173–6, 206–14). Under the title *Retazos de la novela inglesa intitulada Ivanhoe* Blanco gives a summary of the main argument of the novel, interspersing passages translated from the original and adding here and there short appreciations, the effect of the whole being without any doubt attractive in the extreme. It is enhanced by the suggestive introductory paragraphs. In these, after recounting the story of the king who persuaded a courtier to learn Spanish and afterwards destroyed his hopes of a diplomatic appointment by congratulating him on being able now to read Cervantes, the writer adds:

> Semejante pláceme pudiera darse en el día al que aprendiese Inglés de modo que pudiera entender bien y facilmente la série de Novelas que han salido en nuestros días y que se conocen aquí con el nombre general, aunque no bien apropriado, de *Novelas Escocesas*. Dióseles este título porque, aunque el autor no ha querido descubrirse al público, casi no queda duda de que es el celebre poeta escocés *Sir Walter Scott*, y porque los asuntos son, por la mayor parte, relativos a varias épocas de la historia de Escocia, cuyas costumbres, y caracter general, se hallan descritos en estos bellísimos cuentos, con tan vivos coloridos como acaso pluma ninguna ha logrado jamás dar a sus cuadros.
>
> A lo que entendemos, estas novelas se han traducido en Francia—el cómo, Dios lo sabe! porque a nuestro entender muchísimas de sus bellezas no puden (*sic*) traducirse en lengua alguna, así como hay flores que no se pueden arrancar del tallo sin deshojarlas. Por lo que hace a nosotros, aunque la lengua Inglesa y la que ahora escribimos nos son casi igualmente fáciles de entender, no nos hallamos con valor de acometer semejante empresa; y aunque tendríamos el mayor placer en ver obras tan en extremo agradables, en lengua Castellana, nos temblára la pluma en la mano si atentásemos la traducción aun de las que parecen más fáciles (I, pp. 31–2).

The successor of *Variedades* already alluded to (Mora's *Correo literario y político de Londres*, 1826) is not very easy of access: a collection, however, exists in the library of Menéndez y Pelayo at Santander. It is a solid and well-illustrated quarterly, nearly all the contributions to which are long and unsigned, except for a few regular features like 'Variedades.' Mora apologises at length in the first number for himself as being an unworthy successor to Blanco White, and proceeds to describe his plans for the new journal. Each number is to be divided equally between politics and literature—the latter for the most part to be 'literatura amena.' The American bias is evident. There is to be a quarterly biography and portrait of some illustrious American; the preference in books given reviews is to be accorded to those which will interest Americans; and for the sake of American readers the quarter's news is to be given at greater length than in *Variedades*.

There is not a great deal of matter in the *Correo's* nine-months' issues which is of interest to serious students; a few of its articles, however, are worth mention[1].

[1] Its verse, all unsigned (much is Mora's own) is mediocre; its political, geographical and biographical articles do not here concern us; the historical articles, upon England,

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

The first (pp. 8–17) has the attractive and promising title: 'De la poesía castellana; de sus diferentes épocas, y de su estado actual.' It proves to be written with an eye to America, and in itself somewhat disappointing. Beginning with a definition of poetry, it consists mainly of a brief description of each of the 'three periods' into which Spanish poetry may be divided. From its origins to the time of the Reyes Católicos it was simple and natural, if somewhat rude, depending little upon rule, but often full of great beauty. In its second period, except in the works of Luis de León, it shows a decline; the springs of poetry are dried up and foreign affectation abounds. The writer looks askance at the term 'Golden Age': the gold had much dross!

> Hubo poesía clásica y dejó de haber poesía puramente espaũola....La poesía llegó a ser una profesión, una moda, una mania: pocos y muy pocos fueron los genios sobresalientes que conocieron su verdadero espíritu y la cultivaron en toda su pureza[1].

After a period of 'nulidad,' the writer finds that a Renaissance has begun—with Luzán, Montiano and Iriarte! In spite of the strong and noticeable influence of France during the eighteenth century Meléndez and Jovellanos gave a true literary glory to Spain. The chief faults of this age are its artificiality and uniformity, but they are largely due to the miserable conditions under which Spain has existed.

There follows the moral. Now at last Spanish poetry is spreading its wings to soar into the realms of true inspiration. And why should not the American republics share in this flight? So the article ends with a few counsels to would-be American poets.

No reference to the Romantic School in England or France (much less in Spain) appears in this article, and the only reference to foreign poets at all is (for an article dated 1826) a strange one:

> Que este grado de perfección en la Poesía depende en gran parte del grado de perfección social, lo está probando en el día el contraste que ofrecen en este mismo ramo Francia e Inglaterra. Los Franceses confiesan francamente, y en vano querrían negarlo, que sólo tienen actualmente dos poetas, La Vigne, y La Martine; y en la misma época han brillado en Inglaterra Scott, Moore, Campbell, el inmortal Byron, Wordsworth, y otros, aunque menos conocidos, tan dignos como aquellos de la admiración universal que se les tributa.

The only other features of the *Correo* worth citing are reviews (pp. 67–70) of Ackermann's editions in Spanish of the *Talisman* and *Ivanhoe*[2]. As the latter, and probably the former also, was translated by Mora himself and nothing is said in the reviews about the merit of

are translations. Among the reviews are accounts of some length of the works of J. J. Olmedo and Gorostiza. Apart from what is cited in the text above there is nothing further of serious literary interest in the journal.

[1] The writer confesses that his views in this respect are somewhat 'paradoxical.'

[2] See *A Survey of the Influence of Sir Walter Scott in Spain*, pp. 268–9.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

the translation, the writer is, no doubt, Mora. There is first an introduction upon the novel in general, and in particular upon the novels of Scott, 'or of whomever the author of the novels attributed to him may be[1],' which have influenced every country in Europe. The critic then writes eulogistically, though in no great detail, of these novels:

> El autor de Waverley ha sabido cubrir de las flores más seductoras lo que solo presentaba aridez y espinas a los ojos de los lectores vulgares....Esta gran innovación literaria ha recibido el tributo de la admiración de toda la Europa: desde los tiempos de Cervantes, ningún escritor de obras de imaginación ha gozado de aplausos tan generales, y de una popularidad tan sostenida como el novelista escocés.

After describing *Ivanhoe* and the *Talisman* (correctly, so far as our information goes) as the two novels of Scott to be first translated into Spanish, the critic gives a brief account of each in turn. Turning to the translations he says that a 'powerful reason' imposes silence upon him as to their merit: his own authorship would be powerful enough. The task of translation, he concludes, is one of the hardest imaginable, and some of the finest passages it is almost impossible to turn into Spanish at all.

This was a time, as we have seen, when a number of Spanish journals were being published in London by Spanish-Americans. If this seems a strange proceeding, the prospectus to one of them (the *Repertorio Americano*, 1826, Vol. I, p. 2) will explain the reason.

> En el estado presente de América i Europa, Londres es acaso el lugar más adecuado para la publicación de esta obra periódica. Sus relaciones comerciales con los pueblos transatlánticos le hacen en cierto modo el centro de todos ellos; i los auxilios que la circulación industrial suministra a la circulación literaria son demasiado obvios para que sea necesario enumerarlos. Pero Londres no es solamente la metrópoli del comercio: en ninguna parte del globo son tan activas como en la Gran Bretaña las causas que vivifican i fecundan el espíritu humano; en ninguna parte es más audaz la investigación, más libre el vuelo del ingenio, más profundas las especulaciones científicas, más animosas las tentativas de las artes.... Dudamos también que una obra de esta especie pudiese darse a luz con igual libertad en ninguna otra parte de Europa; i el estado del arte tipográfico en América haría sumamente difícil la impresión de un periódico de tanta estensión como la que requieren los objetos arriba indicados.

The *Repertorio* was a continuation of the *Biblioteca Americana* which was published during 1823–4 by a 'Society of Americans,' among whom 'A. B.' (presumably Andrés Bello) and 'G. R.' (García del Río) were the most conspicuous. Though neither journal comes strictly under our purview we may with advantage notice both very briefly. They share interest in literature with geography, history, and natural and social sciences. In the *Biblioteca* the only article of any significance to the

[1] 'Sir Walter Scott, o cualquiera que sea el autor de las novelas que el público de Inglaterra se ha empeñado en atribuir a aquel ilustre Poeta....'

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

student of the literature of its time is one by Bello on Sismondi[1]: a contribution by García del Río on Madame de Staël is very largely composed of quotations[2], and the interest of the remaining literary articles is small[3]. The *Repertorio* divides its attention, in its literary sections, between Latin and Greek authors[4] and modern South American poetry[5]; the article on Heredia's poems[6] is diverting, if not of great value. Heredia is judged, quite favourably, as a disciple of Meléndez and of Byron (!) but in so far as his work represents the 'style of modern poetry' he is recommended to reform[7]! In both journals a number of articles bear witness to Bello's diligent studies, and he refers from time to time to his labours in the British Museum.

The *Museo universal de ciencias y artes* need not detain the reader for long. It was not intended to be literary: 'El objeto que nos proponemos en este periódico,' began the preface, 'es la propagación de todos los conocimientos utiles, y aplicables a la Agricultura, al Comercio, a las Artes productivas.' Articles on mechanics, chemistry, agriculture, hygiene, physics, political economy, education, etc. follow each other, interspersed, more or. less frequently, with shorter ones on a variety of other subjects—fine arts, botany, rural industry, recent inventions, etc. There are, in addition, news paragraphs of a general nature, mainly with scientific bias, a few columns of 'Variedades,' and some reviews of books —Ackermann's publications, of course[8].

An announcement by the publisher at the beginning of No. 8 (April 1,

[1] Vol. II, pp. 42–60. The title explains its purport: 'Noticia de la obra de Sismondi sobre "la literatura del Mediodía de Europa"; refútanse algunas opiniones del autor en lo concerniente a la de España; averíguase la antigüedad del poema del Cid; si el autor de este poema es el que pretende don R. Floranes; juicios de Sismondi demasiado severos respecto de los clásicos castellanos; extracto de su obra relativo al Quijote.'

[2] Vol. I, pp. 17–34: 'Consideraciones sobre la influencia de la literatura en la Sociedad.' Based on Madame de Staël's *De la littérature.*

[3] Fragments of a long poem on America (I, pp. 1–16); a fifteen-page account of Cienfuegos' poetry by Bello (I, pp. 35–50); an article by Río and Bello on the simplification of American spelling (I, pp. 50–62) (cf. *Repertorio*, I, pp. 27–41); an analysis of Schiller's *Wilhelm Tell* (I, pp. 62–71); some notes by Bello in Vol. II on Spanish prosody and several articles on Greek and Latin literature.

[4] Some studies on Vergil in Vol. I, a translation by Olmedo of Horace, *Odes*, I, 14, and bibliographical and other notes.

[5] Notably Bello's review of Olmedo's *La Victoria de Junín*, and an unpublished poem by Olmedo of small merit ('A un amigo en el nacimiento de su primogénito,' Lima, 1817).

[6] Vol. II, pp. 34–45.

[7] P. 44: 'El estilo de la poesía moderna nos parece desviarse algo de las leyes de un gusto severo.

Le recomendamos [al Señor Heredia] el estudio (demasiado desatendido entre nosotros) de los clásicos castellanos i de los grandes modelos de la antigüedad. Los unos castigarán su dicción...los otros acrisolarán su gusto, i le enseñarán a conservar...la templanza de imaginación.'

[8] In a prospectus and a review by Blanco White (*Variedades*, I, pp. 4, 378–9) the *Museo* is described as a kind of counterpart to his own journal—i.e. planned to deal not with literature but with science.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

1826) informs his American readers ('para quienes principalmente se escribe') that in future articles on 'amena literatura' will form part of the journal[1]. From this point to the end of the volume we come upon articles on travel, 'moral tales,' reviews of general literature—not necessarily now published by Ackermann—and even recipes. We may suppose that the public of the *Museo* was gradually becoming more feminine! It did not, in the true sense, become more literary.

The *Emigrado Observador* (1828), which is to be found in the Biblioteca Nacional, enjoyed one brief year of existence before being succeeded by another journal called *Semanario de agricultura y artes* which was 'entirely devoted to these two subjects[2].' It is described on the title-page as being produced by a 'Sociedad de Españoles refugiados en Inglaterra y Francia,' and the preface to Vol. I attributes its birth to the fact that 'muchos de los ilustres *refugiados españoles* divierten los ocios de la emigración con el estudio y con el ejercicio de la industria[3].' In the editorial preface to Vol. II the *Emigrado* is said to be 'the only journal at present maintained by Spanish exiles in any country.'

The prospectus states the aims of the journal in the following terms[4]:

> Se darán cuantas noticias, datos, documentos y reflexiones ofrezca la lectura de las obras clásicas y de los papeles públicos que se anuncian en Inglaterra y Francia, hecha con tendencia a la instrucción de nuestros conciudadanos. En este prontuario, o verdadero libro de memoria, los emigrados españoles en ambas naciones podrán insertar, como en un depósito, los resultados de sus tareas, publicando en él todas las observaciones y descubrimientos que con su estudio, sus faenas y sus talentos hicieren durante la emigración en los ramos enlazados directamente con la pública prosperidad.

From the literary point of view the results of an examination of the journal are extremely small, and it would scarcely be an exaggeration to say that the *Emigrado* has no literary value. Political articles (a large number of them on the subject of intolerance) account for more than one-half the space, and a monthly chronicle of events in many countries occupies one-third the remainder. The rest of the space is divided

[1] 'Movido por este deseo, ha formado el designio de amenizar la aridez de las doctrinas científicas, dedicando la primera parte de cada número a la literatura, y con preferencia a las mas agradables de sus ramificaciones.'

[2] 'Dedicada exclusivamente a la Agricultura y a las Artes' (*Emigrado Observador*, II, p. 243). It was edited by Marcelino Calero y Portocarrero and after No. 127 (15 Dec. 1831) was transferred to Sevilla. (See M. Chaves, *Historia y Bibliografía de la Prensa Sevillana*, Sevilla, 1896, pp. 66–8.) As the *Semanario* is in no way literary, it is unnecessary to say more of it here.

[3] These illustrious persons, however, concealed their identity so well that it is impossible to detect them from their *noms de plume* (such as El Emigrado, Philopatro, etc.) or from the initials at the foot of some articles. These, when collected, yield the following not very illuminating results: J. C., A. Z., X. M., A. T., W. Z. X., Y. Z., R. Z., V. R., X. Z. W., P. V., S., X. R. W., X. V.!! Hardly one of these signatures occurs twice and no contributions are signed except those of two correspondents.

[4] Vol. I, pp. 3–4.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

between science and arts, literature, economics, history and articles headed 'Industria española en la emigración,' i.e. accounts of the occupations of various of the exiles. I estimate the literary part at less than one-twelfth of the whole, and the only articles worthy of mention may be dealt with summarily.

Vol. I, pp. 24–7. Review of a miniature edition of *Don Quijote* (Paris, 1827).

pp. 67–9. Poem on the death of Moratín the younger, sent by one Pablo de Mendibil from London, and composed by Logisto Cario, a Spanish refugee in Paris.

p. 185. A short notice of Alcalá Galiano's inaugural lecture as professor in the 'new University of London' (cf. II, pp. 104–7 for details of this). The subject of the lecture is not mentioned.

Vol. II, pp. 23–4. Review of a collection of Spanish classics in prose and verse edited by Ferrer (an *emigrado*) in Paris.

p. 25 (cf. pp. 140–1). An account from the *Times* of the *Ateneo español* set up in London.

p. 32. 'San Ignacio fundó una nueva religión de estado'—described as a hitherto unpublished satire in verse by Quevedo.

One may remark with some interest upon the French element in the *Emigrado*, but no further literary comment is necessary.

In the very year of the repatriation of the emigrants (1834) the indefatigable Ackermann began a new publication called *El Instructor, o Repertorio de historia, bellas letras y artes*, which was published in monthly parts until the end of 1841. Its editor, J. de Alcala, explains in a preface to the first number that the aim of the journal is to give instruction of a general kind, and that it is conducted in Spanish for the edification of those who prefer to read in that language. The magazine has no literary value. Its articles are usually unsigned, and often illustrated by cuts of places, persons, animals, etc., which may form their subjects. The verse is often puerile or consists of reprints from eighteenth-century writers. There is no chronicle of contemporary events, either political, literary or general.

It will be noticed that the whole of the journalistic activities which can fairly be ascribed to the *exiles*—as distinct from Spaniards residing in England of their own free-will—took place during the Second Emigration.

During the last years, however, of the First Emigration (Sept. 1818 to Aug. 1820) was published the *Español Constitucional* under the aegis of 'P. F. S.' The numbers which we have seen of this review are devoted

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

almost entirely to politics and current events, a very small section being entitled 'Ciencias y artes,' and literature—some patriotic verse and a few reviews—being relegated to the still less prominent section of 'Variedades.' The first number is typical, beginning with a 'Cuadro político de la España bajo Fernando VII,' proceeding after more political excursions to science jottings and scraps of general news, and containing nothing that can be called pure literature except a mediocre verse translation—this by 'P. F. S.' himself.

One last (and earliest) journal, for lack of information about it, must remain anonymous and unlisted. It is that of which Alcalá Galiano speaks so disparagingly in his *Recuerdos*[1]: the passage can only be cited as it stands:

> El citado en primer lugar tenía por redactor principal a un hombre de cortos alcances y escaso saber, que en Cádiz o en la isla de León en 1811 había publicado uno con el título del *Robespierre español*, y que en Inglaterra hacia 1816 y 17 había publicado otro que por su destemplanza había precisado a sus compañeros de destierro a negarle de un modo solemne que fuese expresión de sus doctrinas o pensamientos. A él se agregó y en él escribió no poco un don N. Acevedo, asturiano, que en Madrid en 1821 y 22 había escrito en *El Espectador* titulándose el *Momo*, nombre que inspiraba pretensiones a ser chistoso, por cierto nada fundadas, porque si bien bastante instruido, era de erudición indigesta y muy escaso juicio, escritor pesado, acre, grosero en sus denuestos, y que hasta en 1824 tomó el nombre de Mysse Basileos (si no me engaño) sin reparar en que en un constitucional español no estaba bien declararse odiador de los reyes.

III.

I add a bibliography of all the journals under consideration known to me with a few notes on points of interest. For convenience, the order in which they are treated in Section II is followed.

Ocios || de Españoles emigrados. || Periódico mensual. || Tomo I || Abril, Mayo, Junio y Julio, || 1824 || ...Vitanda est...desidia...Hor. Sat. II. 3. || Londres: || Se vende en casa de los SS. Dulau y Compania; y || Treuttel y Wurtz, Soho-Square; Boosey || e hijo, Old Broad-Street ||. Seven vols. pp. 380, 480, 568, 560, 570, 388, 574 respectively.

B.M.: PP. 4072. Seven volumes, covering periods as follows: Vol. I, April to June 1824; Vol. II, July to December 1824; Vols. III to V, half years to June 1826; Vol. VI, July to October 1826; Vol. VII, 1827. With Vol. VII begins a 'Segunda época'; the journal bears the new title: 'Ocios de Españoles emigrados en Londres: Periódico Trimestre'; and a prefatory note, referring to the suspension of the journal since October 1826, outlines its continuation 'por algún tiempo,' 'hasta fines de 1827,' 'dándole otra forma cómoda y ventajosa, cuanto ser pueda, para el público.'

Variedades; || ó || Mensajero de Londres: || Periódico Trimestre || por || el Rev^do^ Joseph Blanco White || Tomo I || Londres || Lo publica R. Ackermann, 101, Strand || 1824. Two vols. pp. 499, 399 respectively.

[1] See note, p. 447 above.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

B.M. : 888, l. 9, 10. Two volumes, 1824–5. The *Advertencia* to Vol. I states that the journal will be published quarterly subject to a satisfactory reception in America and elsewhere. There are a number of coloured plates (chiefly, but not entirely, of fashions) in each volume.

(H. T.) Correo || literario y politico || de || Londres || Tomo I || Enero 1, 1826 || No. I.

(T.) Correo || literario y politico || de || Londres : || Periodico trimestre. || por J. J. de Mora. || Londres : || publicado por R. Ackermann, 101, Strand, || y en su establecimiento en Megico ; || asimismo || en Colombia, en Buenos Ayres, Chile, Peru, y Guatemala. || 1826. || pp. 378.

Biblioteca Menéndez y Pelayo, Santander. In the Santander copy the title-page is bound up in the body of the text (at p. 281).

El || Repertorio || Americano. || Tomo primero || Octubre de 1826 || Londres : || en la librería de Bossange, Barthés i Lowell, || 14, Great Marlborough Street || 1826. || Vols. I, II (1826–7), each pp. 320.

B.M. : PP. 4086. The prospectus (I, pp. 1–6) explains that the journal is a quarterly and a continuation of the *Biblioteca Americana* with the same editors. It is to be 'aun mas rigurosamente americana' than its predecessor.

La || Biblioteca Americana || No. I || Tomo I || Julio de 1823 || Londres || En la imprenta de Don G. Marchant, Ingram-Court ; || Se hallará en casa de Bossange and Co. Great Marl||borough-Street and Regent-Street ; Booth, Duke-||Street, Portland-Place ; and J. M. Richardson, Corn-||Hill, Opposite the Royal Exchange. || Precio 3*s.* 6*d.* (Dedication : 'Al pueblo americano.') Vol. I, pp. 470.

B.M. : 888, l. 12. The copy consists of Vol. I bound up with pp. 1–60 of Vol. II which bears the title 'La Biblioteca Americana, o Miscelánea de literatura, artes i ciencias, Por una Sociedad de Americanos' and the dedication 'Al Gobierno de Colombia.' The bound copy contains Numbers 1–3, presented to the British Museum by Garcia del Rio, and a holograph letter accompanying this gift and dated Sept. 24, 1823, is bound up with it.

(H. T.) Museo Universal || de || Ciencias y Artes || (Engraving) || Lo Publico (*sic*) R. Ackermann, en su Repositorio de Artes, || 101 Strand, Londres.

(T.) Museo Universal || de || Ciencias y Artes. || por || J. J. de Mora. || Tomo I. || Londres : || Publicado por R. Ackermann, Strand ; || y en su establecimiento en Megico : || asimismo || En Colombia, Buenos Aires, Chile, Peru, y Guatemala. || 1825 ||. 2 vols. pp. 384, 260. Vol. II is similar but for date, 1826.

B.M. : PP. 4072*b*. A second edition of Vol. I is also in B.M. (888, l. 11) with similar contents and H. T. but T. thus : Museo Universal || de || Ciencias y Artes. || Tomo I || Londres. || Lo publica el Señor Ackermann, || 101, Strand, || y en su establecimiento de Megico. || 1825.

El || Emigrado Observador, || Periódico mensual, || por || una sociedad || de || Españoles refugiados || en || Inglaterra y Francia. || Año de 1828. ||

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Londres: || Publicado e impreso por M. Calero, || 17, Frederick Place Goswell Road. ||

Bib. Nac. (1/50074) has two six-monthly volumes (July 1828—June 1829) of 242 and 248 pp. respectively. The second volume has the same title-page, except for the date, as the first.

El Instructor, || o || Repertorio || de || Historia, Bellas Letras y Artes || 'Sunt bona, sunt quædam mediocra, sunt mala multa || Quæ legis hic; aliter non fit, avite, liber.' || Martialis, Lib. I, *Epigrammatum* || Tomo I || Londres: || en casa de Ackermann y Comp^a || Repositorio de Artes, 96, Strand || 1834. ||

B.M.: PP. 4245.

El || Español Constitucional: || o Miscelánea de Política, Ciencias y Artes, Literatura, &c. || Periódico Mensual || (Tabla de Materias) || Londres: || Impreso por Enrique Bryer, en Bridge Street, Blackfriars || Se vende en la librería de T. Boosey e hijos, || no. 4, Broad Street, cerca de la Bolsa || 1818 ||.

B.M. has Nos. XXI of Vol. III (May) and XXIV (August) of Vol. IV (1820) only (pp. 321–400; 81–160). The index to No. XXIV has the notice: 'Indice de los núm. XXIII, y XXIV, *Los dos últimos publicados en Londres.*' The later volumes of the collection are printed by L. Thompson, 19 Great St Helens, Bishopsgate Street. The details in the text concerning the earlier numbers have been kindly supplied to me by Professor Milton A. Buchanan, of Toronto, who has them in his own library, and to whom I also owe the transcription made above of the title-page of the first number.

E. ALLISON PEERS.

LIVERPOOL.

Digitized by Google

Original from
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES.

The Origin of the Play of 'Moses and the Tables of the Law.'

In the English miracle-cycles the Exodus is treated of in two parts, one part dealing with the Moses-Pharaoh episode and the other with the Giving of the Law. The order and number of the incidents in the Pharaoh play are substantially those of the liturgy, to the influence of which accordingly, and not to that of the 'Prophetae,' this play is now rightly credited[1]. About the origin of the Moses-and-the-Law play, however, even those, who advocate Craig's recent theory of the origin, generally, of the Old Testament plays, not from the 'Processus Prophetarum' of the Christmas Season, but from the lectiones and responsoria of the period of Septuagesima and Lent, are not agreed. Craig[2] himself observes that in the Chester cycle the Giving of the Law is followed by Balaam in the same pageant, and that the 'Processus Prophetarum' of the Towneley and Ludus Coventriae cycles begins with Moses and the Tables of the Law; he concludes that this evidence indicates that the play of the Tables of the Law 'grew out of the "Processus" and has therefore a very different origin from the play of Moses and the Exodus[3].' Kretzmann too observes that Moses appears in the Prophetae, in one case at least, with the Tables; he, however, adds: 'But the representation of Moses with the Two Tables is a traditional subject in the liturgy and in expositions and need not cause surprise in the Prophetae. The liturgy in the Responsoria in Hebdomada quarta in Quadragesima expressly states: "Vs: Descendit Moyses de monte portans duas tabulas lapideas in manibus suis, scriptas utrasque digito Dei[4]."'

The following observations of mine may serve to indicate that we have no trustworthy evidence for believing that the Giving-of-the-Law episode in our cycles grew out of the Prophetae, while, on the other hand, there are signs that it got its suggestion at least from the liturgical and homiletic material of the Lenten season.

[1] See Kretzmann, *The Liturgical Element in the Earliest Forms of the Medieval Drama*, p. 78. Note also that the 'Cantemus domino' which concludes the York Pharaoh Play (XI) is very probably derived from the canticle, based on Exodus xv, chanted as one of the Psalms in the Roman liturgical Office.

[2] 'The Origin of the O. T. Plays' (*Modern Philology*, x, p. 476).

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 476, footnote 1.

[4] Kretzmann, *op. cit.*, p. 86.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

With regard to the Chester cycle, the presence in one and the same play of the episode of the Giving of the Law and Balaam-and-the-Processus is hardly evidence of the former having grown out of the latter. For if we examine the Chester pageants and compare them with, say, those of York, we shall find that in the Chester cycle, as handed down to us, a single pageant serves, not seldom, to dramatize more than one scriptural event, while in the York cycle, on the other hand, a single episode is handled in parts by different pageants. For instance, Y. has expanded the story of the Fall of Man into five plays; Ch. in a big play of over 700 ll. has dramatized not only the entire story of the Fall but also that of the murder of Abel. The exigencies of gild and processional production readily account for these divergences in stage economy. Hence, that the Moses-and-the-Law incident is followed immediately by Balaam and the Prophets may be due simply to an adaptation of the performance to suit the resources of the crafts and the general circumstances of the production of these plays. The welding together of these two episodes into one play was the more natural here as the 'Processus' was dominated by the Balaam-Balak story to such an extent that it seems to have been considered not so much a 'Processus' as a Balaam play[1]; and Moses and Balaam could very well be accommodated together in a single pageant without in any way impairing the cyclic idea inherent in the entire spectacle.

In the Towneley 'Processus' (play VII), as we have it, Moses officiates as both prophet (after the Pseudo-Augustinian Sermon) and law-giver. In the latter capacity he carries the Two Tables and declares the Decalogue in the middle of his part. Kretzmann's explanation of this I have already quoted. Now I shall attempt to show that the inclusion of the Law-giving may even be the result of a later interpolation into the play.

Both this play and play IX are composed in a 6-line stanza, the former partly in *a a b c c b* and partly in *a a b a a b*, and the latter wholly in *a a b a a b*[2]. Both belong to the Prophet class of plays and, though, in the cycle in its present form, the Pharaoh play (VIII) intervenes, play IX was evidently meant to come immediately after VII. Everything seems to point to both the plays existing substantially in the form in which they were first composed. But attention may be drawn to a point in the

[1] Thus, in the apparently less primitive version of the play preserved in the other MSS. of this cycle, all the prophecies, excepting the one of Balaam's about the Star of Jacob, have totally disappeared, and we are left only with the Moses and Balaam incidents.

[2] In the E.E.T.S. Edition the stanza structure of play IX is said to be *a a b a a b* on p. xxiii, but *a a b c c b* on p. 78, possibly because of the occurrence of the rimes 'standys-landys-band-hand' (st. 3) and 'know-saw-blowys-lawes' (st. 16). But these were meant to form only one rime however imperfect. Cf. 74/325, 327, 329, 331; York 80/201, 203.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

preservation of play VII with its two types of verse. It will be noticed that the prophecies of Moses and David begin and end in stanzas of the *a a b a a b* type, and that the entire prophecies of Sibyl and Daniel are in those of the *a a b c c b* type. Is this division of verse merely accidental? I think not. It seems to me that the *a a b c c b* stanzas are a later attempt to modify and add to the play (originally composed, as play IX indicates, in the *a a b a a b* stanza-type) by a reviser who sought to copy the metrical form of the play he worked upon.

If we examine the prophecy of Moses in the light of the introductory Latin lines which serve as the text of the pronouncement, we notice that the prophecy proper ends with the words:

> Bot all ouer will man prophete ken
> with worship amongis men,
> Bot in his awne countre,

which are a rendering of the last Latin line, 'Nemo propheta,' etc. If we now turn to stanza 15 containing the final words of Moses, we find that in it Moses, in disclosing his identity, declares that he it was who received the Commandments on Mount Sinai. Between these two stanzas there stand nine stanzas devoted to recounting the Commandments. These look very much like an interpolation. Taking them in connexion with stanzas 5 and 15 and noting that the greeting ('Herkyns all,' etc.) with which stanza 6 opens is similar to those with which new arrivals are wont to introduce themselves to the audience, one is inclined to believe that, what with the liturgical representations before him and the mention of the Decalogue in stanza 15, an editor handling the play was prompted to insert these nine stanzas into it. And if textual considerations suggest that these verses are a later insertion, a metrical criterion is not wanting to support the hypothesis, for these stanzas are precisely the ones that differ in structure from the rest of Moses' pronouncement.

A similar examination of the prophecies of David, Sibyl and Daniel would seem to suggest that this same reviser has modified portions of David's utterance, leaving the beginning and the end, however, untouched, and that the verses ascribed to Sibyl and Daniel are, as they stand, additions to, or complete revisions of, the original text by the same hand.

Craig considers the Ludus Coventriae play of Moses and the Tables (VI) a part of the 'Prophetae.' But not only is it to be regarded as a distinct pageant, as the 'Explicit Moyses' at the end of it shows, but also it is in no way connected with any prophecy. Moses himself does not deliver the prophecy which in the 'Processus' sometimes, as in

Digitized by Google

Original from
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Towneley VII, he is made to deliver. On the other hand, there are indications that the play probably utilized some of the liturgical material of the Quadragesimal season. Kretzmann[1] has directed attention to the dragging in of the Burning-of-the-Bush incident into this play as 'due to the influence of expository writings which may have served as lectiones, the burning bush being a prototype of the Savior.' Again, the distinction made, in ll. 60–64, between the Two Tables, one containing the three laws touching man's relations with God and the other the remaining seven touching man's relation with his fellow-man, is exactly the one made, for instance, in the Lambeth MS. homily 'Hic Dicendum est de Quadragesima[2].'

Lastly, in Cornwall the Prophet and Nativity plays do not appear to have developed at all. Hence it is conclusive, not only, as Craig declares, that 'Old Testament plays are originally and organically part of the Easter series[3],' but also that the episode of Moses and the Two Tables which figures in the Cornish 'Origo Mundi,' as in the Chester, Towneley and Hegge cycles, cannot be regarded as an outgrowth of the Prophetae.

Thus the direct evidence of the 'Origo Mundi' and the Ludus Coventriae play, and the indirect evidence of the Chester and Towneley plays combine to support the view that no distinction, in the matter of origin, need be made between the play of Pharaoh and that of the Giving of the Law, both being directly traceable to the liturgical and homiletic material of the Lenten season.

CALCUTTA. P. E. DUSTOOR.

ON THE DATE OF DONNE'S 'HYMNE TO GOD MY GOD, IN MY SICKNESSE.'

One of the minor problems concerning Donne's poetry which Professor Grierson's great edition of the *Poems* has left undecided is the date of the composition of the hymn *To God my God, in my sicknesse.* The question is discussed by Professor Grierson (*Poems*, II, p. 274), and the main facts of the case are taken from his statement. The poem is well known, but is printed here in full for purposes of reference.

Hymne to God my God, in my sicknesse.

Since I am comming to that Holy roome,
Where, with thy Quire of Saints for evermore,
I shall be made thy Musique; As I come
I tune the Instrument here at the dore,
And what I must doe then, thinke here before.

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 86.
[2] *Old English Homilies*, 1st Series, p. 11.
[3] Craig, *op. cit.*, p. 486.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Whilst my Physitians by their love are growne
  Cosmographers, and I their Mapp, who lie
Flat on this bed, that by them may be showne
  That this is my South-west discoverie
  Per fretum febris, by these streights to die,

I joy, that in these straits, I see my West;
  For, though their currants yeeld returne to none,
What shall my West hurt me? As West and East
  In all flatt Maps (and I am one) are one,
  So death doth touch the Resurrection.

Is the Pacifique Sea my home? Or are
  The Easterne riches? Is *Ierusalem*?
Anyan, and *Magellan*, and *Gibraltare*,
  All streights, and none but streights, are wayes to them,
  Whether where *Iaphet* dwelt, or *Cham*, or *Sem*.

We think that *Paradise* and *Calvarie*,
  Christs Crosse, and *Adams* tree, stood in one place;
Looke Lord, and finde both *Adams* met in me;
  As the first *Adams* sweat surrounds my face,
  May the last *Adams* blood my soule embrace.

So, in his purple wrapp'd receive mee Lord,
  By these his thornes give me his other Crowne;
And as to other soules I preach'd thy word,
  Be this my Text, my Sermon to mine owne,
  Therfore that he may raise the Lord throws down.

In 1640, in his life of Donne prefixed to the LXXX *Sermons*, Walton referred the hymn to Donne's deathbed, and eighteen years later, in the separate and amended edition of the life, gave the exact date of composition as March 23, 1630/1. This assertion forms the only authoritative piece of evidence there is that the hymn was written at this date, but it is strengthened in several ways. If the hymn was composed in 1631, and not seven or eight years earlier, that explains why it is only found in one of the MS. collections of Donne's poems (Stowe MS. 961); moreover the chief figure in the poem, the straits leading to the Pacific Sea, was used in a sermon preached on Easter Day, 1629 (LXXX *Sermons*, XXIV, p. 241), and in another preached on February 12, 1630 (XXVI *Sermons*, V, p. 71); while the simile of the map pasted on a globe occurs in an undated sermon (LXXX *Sermons*, LV, p. 558) which Miss E. M. Spearing (*The Modern Language Review*, Oct. 1913, p. 478) assigns to the year 1628. This internal evidence, together with Walton's decisive statement, is perhaps strong; but evidence still stronger may be urged against it.

A copy of the poem found among the papers of Sir Julius Caesar (see Gosse's *Life and Letters of Donne*, II, p. 279) bears the statement that the hymn was written in Donne's 'Great sickness in December 1623'; and this date seems to be a very serious rival to that given by Walton. It is true that the copyist may have confused it with the

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

hymn 'Wilt thou forgive that sin' which we know to have been composed during the 'Great sickness,' but the mistake is just as likely to be with Walton, who is always inaccurate in his dates.

In an examination of the poem, the first indication to be noticed is the title itself. It is obviously Donne's own name for the hymn; and 'my sicknesse' would be a strange way of describing his mortal illness, a week before his death. It is, rather, a retrospective title, given to an illness after recovery has actually taken place. This point need not be pressed, but it leads to the most important question of all: which is, intrinsically, the most likely date for the composition of such a poem: the winter of the year 1623, in which it is known that the mind of Donne on his sick bed was awake and busily composing the *Devotions* and another hymn; or 1631, in the last week of his life, when he has said farewell to his friends, arranged his affairs, taken 'his last leave of his beloved Studie,' and already lain a week 'earnestly expecting his hourely change'? Of this hymn Mr Gosse says (*Life and Letters*, II, p. 280), 'He had never, in the heyday of his youth and genius, expressed himself with a more complete originality or more fully in accordance with the peculiarities of his intellectual temperament'; and even if we suppose that Donne wrote at all on his death-bed, this hymn breathes a very different spirit from the peace and calm of mind which Walton ascribes to his last days.

On the other hand the tone of the whole poem bears a striking resemblance to that of the *Devotions*, which were, of course, produced during the 'Great sickness of December 1623,' and if it be examined more closely, several obvious similarities to passages from the *Devotions* are to be found. Such passages should have more weight than any quoted in favour of the 1631 date, for they do not occur in writings distant two or three years from the alleged date of the hymn, but in a book which was composed during the same illness, and at the very same time.

First, in line 6 are the words 'Whilst my Physitians by their love[1] are growne Cosmographers,' with which may be compared the last words of the fifth *Expostulation* in the *Devotions*, 'that *Phisician* who is my faithfull *friend*.' This raises another point: Donne certainly did not have physicians (or even a physician) in attendance on March 23, 1630/1. On January 1 he was deliberately disobeying the prescriptions of Dr Fox, and telling him that 'he longed for the day of his dissolution,' and Walton makes no further reference to a doctor. Three months later,

[1] 'Loer' in Sir Julius Caesar's MS. must be a mistake.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

when he was 'expecting his hourely change,' he would have refused all medical help; and now that 'he was so happy as to have nothing to do but to die,' he would not speak so approvingly of his physicians' 'love' as he does in the hymn. In the *Devotions*, on the other hand, his physicians and their consultations are a constant subject for meditation.

The reference to a 'flatt Map' in line 14, which was repeated probably in 1628 (see above), was also used within a month or two of December 1623; for in a letter to Sir Robert Ker, written in February or March 1624, when Donne was consulting him about the dedication of the *Devotions* and sending him proofs of the book (see *Life and Letters*, II, pp. 189, 191), this sentence occurs: 'If a flat map be pasted upon a round globe the farthest east and the farthest west meet and are all one[1].'

Again, the reference in line 24 to 'the first *Adams* sweat' is echoed in the *Devotions*: 'It was part of *Adams* punishment, *In the sweat of thy browes thou shalt eate thy bread*: it is multiplied to me, I have earned bread in the sweat of my browes, in the labor of my calling, and I have it; and I sweat againe, and againe, from the brow, to the sole of the foot, but I eat no bread, I tast no sustenance' (*Meditation* 2). The verbal antithesis in lines 24 and 25 between the sweat and the blood is repeated later in the same book (*Prayer* 9): 'At more poores than this slacke body sweates teares, this sad soule weeps blood.' In the last stanza of the poem come the words, 'By these his thornes give me his other Crowne,' which correspond in every way with the closing words of the second *Prayer* in the *Devotions*: 'And, *O my God*, who madest thyself a *Light* in a *Bush*, in the middest of these *brambles*, and *thornes* of a sharpe sicknesse, appeare unto me so, that I may see thee, and know thee to be my *God*, applying thy selfe to me, even in these sharp, and thorny passages. Doe this, O *Lord*, for his sake, who was not the lesse, the *King of Heaven*, for thy suffering him to be *crowned* with *thornes*, in this world[2].'

Finally, Professor Grierson has pointed out (II, p. 274) that the last line of the poem—'Therfore that he may raise the Lord throws down'—is recalled by some words in the third *Expostulation*, 'therefore I am *cast downe*, that I might not be *cast away*.'

Internal evidence, then, provides five clear echoes of the *Devotions*

[1] Cf. too *The Annuntiation and Passion* (dated in MSS. 1608; *Poems*, I, p. 335), line 21: 'As in plaine Maps, the furthest West is East.'

[2] The same thought is found in the sonnet *La Corona* (*Poems*, I, p. 318), which Professor Grierson, in his note on the *Divine Poems* (II, pp. 225–9), assigns to 1609 or 1617—probably the former.

Digitized by Google Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

in a hymn of half a dozen stanzas, strongly supporting the theory that both were the product of the same illness in the closing months of the year 1623. If sermons of *about* 1623 were examined to find support for this date, as has been done for the later date, no doubt more evidence, as strong as that which opposes it, could be added; but attention has been confined to what is known to have been written in the very same year, probably in the very same month, as the alleged date of the hymn.

Even stronger, however, is the argument from probability. Donne, on March 23, 1631, as any reader of Walton's story can see, was past the help of physicians, past the writing of hymns. Donne in December 1623 was busy writing, and writing what in general and in detail bears a great resemblance to the hymn itself. Walton's love of the theatrical and the romantic must have led him to make this poem—written indeed under the shadow of death—actually the swan song of the dying Donne.

JOHN SPARROW.

WINCHESTER.

ESSEX PLACE-NAMES IN '-ING.'

To judge from his treatment of Essex names Professor Ekwall's *English Place-names in -ing* is remarkably complete, but this very completeness makes it the more desirable to supplement his evidence where possible. Several of the names, e.g. Barling, Fobbing, Mucking, Rickling, and Wakering, I have independently explained in the same way (these have not yet been published). **Epping** (p. 43), I formerly derived from O.E. Eoppa[1], but fresh material has proved this wrong[2]: 1227 F.F. *Upping*; 1436 Pat. R. *Iphyng*; 1455 ib. *Yppynge*; 1509–47 Hist. MSS., III, 274 *Ipping*; 1508 Winstone, Epping and Ongar Highway Trust, 287 *Ippyng*. Either this was not originally a name in *-ingas* or it interchanged with *-ingaþorp* (cf. p. 123): 1314 Ipm. *Eppingethorp*; 1403 Ipm. R. *Eppingthorp*. It goes back to O.E. **Yppingaþorp* 'the village of the upland dwellers.' The original settlement was not on the site of the modern Epping Town but some two miles north-west near Epping Upland Church on the high land overlooking Cobbins Brook, a tributary of the Lea. The growth of the town was due to the diversion of the road *c.* 1518.

Ing (p. 45)[3]: 1363 Cl. R. *Mounteneye Giginge*; 1428 Pat. R. *Mar-*

[1] *English*, vol. III, p. 525.

[2] I here use the same abbreviations as Ekwall. For sources he has not used, those of the *Survey of English Place-names*.

[3] Buttsbury is an older name than Ekwall imagines. It occurs frequently from the beginning of the thirteenth century: 1219 F.F. *Botolfvespirie*.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

garete Guyng (2); 1441 ib. *Margaret Guyinge, Guynge*; 1491 Ipm. *Marget Guynge.* These forms confirm Ekwall's opinion that the personal name involved was a dissyllable and suggest **Gigingas* as the origin.

Goddings (p. 44): the only place-name form given here cannot be satisfactorily identified. Geoffrey le Esqurel who is connected with it is one of the family that gave name to Squirrell's Heath in Havering[1], an entirely different part of the county, but John le Waleys, who is also mentioned, can be connected with Little Henny[2], some six or seven miles from Little Yeldham. The form may refer to this place but does not prove it is an *-ing* name. The *Geddinges* forms do not belong here. The first refers to Fulko de Geddinges and his land in Wakering. He held two virgates in Clavering in 1200[3] and his family gave name to *Geddynges* (1442 Ipm. R.), now Clavering Place. This possessive type of name is very common in Essex. Wright[4] says Goddings was in the possession of the Goodinge family in the reigns of Richard II and Henry IV. Richard de Godding of 1236 may have been an early member of this family.

Stebbing (p. 49): this is derived from an O.E. **Stybbingas.* I prefer to regard it as parallel with the Stubbings of p. 26 in the sense of 'clearing.' The plural forms may be compared with those for Bocking and Clavering, both undoubtedly singular names. The word was in use in Essex as a field-name: 1263 F.F. (field called) *Stubbing* (in Gestingthorpe or Wickham St Paul's); 1316 Inq. aqd. *Stebbinge atte Ginge*; 1441 *East Anglian*, v (N.S.), 108 (croftam) *Lytle, Mochille Stubbyng(g)e* (in Ashen). The objection that this is a parish name is disposed of by the examples on pp. 25–26.

Terling (p. 50): this is definitely from O.E. **Tyrlingas* 'the dwellers on the banks of the Tyrl.' The name occurs once as *Tyrlinge* (1338 Ipm.). In 1245 we read of 'A certain way in Terlyng called the way of *Terleford*.....the said way from that water called *Terleford*[5].' The name of the river given here must have meant originally 'the ford over the Terle.' Unfortunately this method of referring to rivers is not uncommon in Essex documents with the result that real river-names are difficult to find. The Chelmer appears as *the water of Shelmereford* (1239 F.F.) and the Stour as *aqua de Manitre* (1349 Orig.).

[1] Havering cannot be used as an example of a hundred-name ending in *-ing* (p. 119). The *Liberty* of Havering was part of Becontree Hundred at the time of the Domesday survey and later.

[2] *Essex Fines*, vol. I, p. 111.

[3] *Curia Regis Rolls*, vol. I, p. 359.

[4] *History of Essex*, vol. I, p. 534.

[5] *Essex Fines*, vol. I, p. 150.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Roothing (p. 48): Zachrisson and Ekwall agree in deriving this name from O.E. **Hrōðingas*. This is undoubtedly wrong for the following forms must be taken into account: 1111 Monasticon, IV, 100 *Radingas*; 1236 B.F. I, 590 *Alba Raynges*; 1243 F.F. *Rainges*; 1282 Ch. R. *Blancherathynges*; 1309 Inq. aqd. *Eytrope Wrothinge*; 1330 Ipm. *Whiterouchingge*; 1471 Pat. R. *Beauchamp Redyng*; 1490 ib. *High Redyng*; 1558–1603 Proc. Chanc. Eliz., II, 102 *High Radingbury* alias *Roothingburie*; 1688 *Essex Review*, XV, 27 *White Ruding*. I cannot advance a satisfactory explanation, but Mawer's suggestion that the parishes are named from the river[1] is untenable. Below Chipping Ongar the Roding was called the *Ivell* according to Harrison[2] and is mentioned in the thirteenth century at Loughton as the 'river called *Hyle*...stream of water called *Hyle*[3]'; hence Ilford: 1234 F.F. *Hileford*, 1330 Ipm. R., 1373 Pat. R. *Hilleford* 'the ford over the Hyle.' North of Ongar the river had another name. The modern parish of Shellow Bowells just touches the river which here winds considerably: 1086 D.B. *Scelga, Scelda*; 1198 F.F. *Scelléé*; late twelfth century Ind. *Selgh*; 1248 F.F. *Shelleghes* (in parish of Willingehall); 1274 H.R. *Schelewen, Chelewen*; 1297 Ipm. *Schelewford*; from O.E. *sceolh* 'oblique, awry.' There is even a possible third name further north still for Canfield is in D.B. *Canedfelda*, a solitary form, but one which, if correct, suggests a possible connexion with the Kennet, a known river-name[4].

Hedingham (p. 129): a fuller collection of forms shows the name is by no means easy to explain. Hinckford, the name of the hundred, has the same origin. Dr J. H. Round has rightly suggested that the ford was that across the Colne joining the two Hedinghams. Thus any connexion with *hȳð* is impossible; a ford is incompatible with a landing-place. Some of our forms are late, but the local pronunciation [hinigəm] makes it necessary to consider them: 1111 Monasticon, IV, 100 *Hethigaham, Hethingeham*; 1216–72 Ipm. *Henigeham*; 1373 Pap., 1473 Pat. R. *Henyngham*; 1484 Pat. R. *Hithingham, Hinigam*; 1513 L.P.H. *Henyngham, Hevenyngham*; *c.* 1535 Val. *Hedningham* (4). The first element I take to be a patronymic from O.E. *Headuwine*[5].

No examples of palatalization are given for Essex. There are cer-

[1] *Place-names: An Essay in Co-operative Study*, p. 13.
[2] *Holinshed*, vol. I, p. 51 *b*.
[3] *Essex Arch. Soc. Trans.*, vol. XII, p. 255.
[4] A modern example of this type is the river which flows through Romford. North of the town it is called the Rom, to the south the Beam. Similarly the Blackwater, north of Braintree, is known as the Pant, once the name of the whole stream.
[5] Only a selection of forms can be given here.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

tainly two: Dengie: 1222 St Paul's D. *danningam*; 1275 F.F. *Danengeye*[1]; and Bobbingworth, locally known as Bovinger: 1086 D.B. *Bubingeorda*. Pengy Mill [pendʒi] in Chignal may be compared with Penge, Surrey. The only forms I have met with are: 1544 *Essex Review*, XXXII, 141 *Penge Park*; 1777 Chapman and André's map *Painge-Mill Farm*.

I may, perhaps, be permitted to add a note on two Middlesex names. **Charing** (p. 52) is in my opinion undoubtedly from O.E. *cerring* 'turning': 1258 Pat. R. *La Cherryng*; 1263 ib. *La Charryng*.

Notting (p. 52): Gover is incorrect in regarding Notting Hill as a back formation from *Knottinge Bernes* (1476). Nor do I think Ekwall's view correct—that the place was named from a man who took his name from Knotting in Beds.: 1361 Pat. R. *Knottynghull*; 1376 Cl. R. *Knottyngwode*. These forms suggest that a more probable origin is dial. *knot* 'hill' from O.E. *cnotta* 'knot,' in spite of the fact that this meaning is found only in Northern dialects (cf. p. 67).

PERCY H. REANEY.

LONDON.

MOCKBEGGAR HALL.

This place-name was sufficiently common in East Anglia to find a place in Forby's *Vocabulary of East Anglia* (II, pp. 217–8) where it is described as 'a house with an inviting external aspect, but within poor and bare, dirty, and disorderly, and disappointing those who beg alms at the door.' This agrees closely with Professor Weekley's explanation (*M.L.R.*, XVII, p. 413) and the fact that it occurs at least from Sussex to Norfolk and Derbyshire and is the type of name so frequently coined during the war lends support to Professor Mawer's interpretation of 'snape-guest.'

There is a Mockbeggars' Hall, sometimes called Old Hall in Claydon, Suffolk, which was erected, at least in part, in 1621, and is known to have been long unoccupied at the beginning of the nineteenth century[2]. In Hethersett, Norfolk, was a meadow called *The Mockbeggar*, on one side of which was a broad, deep moat, and near by the remains of an ancient dwelling[3]. In 1789, in the manor of Coggeshall Hall, Essex, was 'a messuage, barn, stable, and seven closes of arable and pasture land, called *Mockbeggars*, with a chaceway lying in Feering[4],' which has now been strangely disguised as *Maltbeggars Farm*.

[1] There is an alternative type: *on Denesige*, K.C.D. 957. Here we seem to have a pure patronymic, and one formed, too, after the Danish invasions. Another example is Danbury, 1086 D.B. *Danengeb[er]ia*; 1234 F.F. *Daningebir'*; 1285 Pat. R. *Danyngebyry* etc. Both are derived from the personal name *Dene* 'the Dane.'

[2] *East Anglian*, vol. IV (N. S.), p. 367. [3] *Ibid*.

[4] Beaumont, *History of Coggeshall*, p. 132.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

The name is by no means recent. Among the *Roxburghe Ballads* (II, 449–53) is one entitled 'The Map of Mock-begger Hall, with his scituation in the spacious Countrey, called *Anywhere*. To the tune of *It is not your Northerne Nanny: or Sweet is the Lasse that Louves Me*.' It was printed in London 'for *Richard Harper*, neere to the Hospital gate in Smithfield.' The ballad consists of two parts each of six stanzas, with a refrain. There were two copies in the collection, one considerably older than the other. The later one the editor dates as *c.* 1635, the earlier 'was probably printed quite early in the reign of James I.' This date is confirmed and Hindley's remark (I, pp. xv–xvi) that 'the author nowhere explains precisely what he means by Mockbegger Hall: it seems to have reference to some lost production of the same kind, in which it was introduced and celebrated,' is explained by a passage in Green's *Short History of the English People* (Illustrated Edition, vol. III, pp. lxxxvi, 966):

> At the close of Elizabeth's reign, and throughout the reign of James I and the early years of Charles, there was much complaining in the rural districts because the nobles and gentry flocked up to London, leaving the country-houses empty and neglected, so that where in former times there had been feasting for rich and poor alike, a beggar could not now get a crust of bread. To the houses thus deserted was given the nick-name of 'Mock-beggar Hall.'

It is unnecessary to assume a still earlier version of the ballad. The allusion was so topical that there was no need for explanation. The ballad is too long to quote in full: stanzas 1, 2, and 11 are enough to prove the true origin of the name:

I Reade in ancient times of yore,
That men of worthy calling
Build almes houses and Spittles store,
Which now are all downe falling:
And few men seeke them to repaire,
Nor is there one among twenty,
That for good deeds will take any care,
While mock begger hall stands empty.

Farme houses which their fathers built,
And Land well kept by tillage,
Their Prodigall sons have sold for gilt,
In every Towne and village.
To th' City and Court they doe resort
With gold and silver plenty,
And there they spend their time in sport,
While mock beggers hall stand empty.

.....

Some Gentlemen and Citizens have
In divers eminent places,
Erected houses rich and brave,
Which stood for the owners graces,
Let any poore to such a doore
Come, they expecting plenty,
They there may ask till their throats are sore,
For mock begger hall stands empty.

LONDON. PERCY H. REANEY.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

The Liberation of Castile.

Commentators on the *Poema de Fernán González* and its congeners do not appear to have cited, in connexion with the curious episode of the Liberation of Castile (*Poema de Fernán González*, coplas 569–74), a remarkable passage in Jordanes, *Getica*, cap. v, which reads:

> nec eorum fabulas alicubi repperimus scriptas, qui eos (sc. Gothos, cf. Mommsen's Introduction, p. xxxviii) dicunt in Brittania vel in unaqualibet insularum in servitute redactos et in unius caballi praetio a quodam ereptos. aut certe si quis eos aliter dixerit in nostro urbe, quam quod nos diximus, fuisse exortos, nobis aliquid obstrepebit: nos enim potius lectioni credimus quam fabulis anilibus consentimus.
>
> (Ed. Mommsen, *Mon. Ger. Hist.*, *Auct. Ant.*, tom. v.)

This passage comes to us, according to Mommsen's analysis, at fourth-hand. Jordanes is responsible for the phrasing, which leaves some doubt whether *eos* means *Gothos* or *Hunuguros*. Cassiodorus contributes the preference for written sources for history. Ablavius reports the fact, and he in turn depends on an allusion, perhaps a cross reference in some such saga as that which relates the adventures of Filimer in Oium, the subject of the previous paragraphs. This particular saga appears to have been outside his resources, which were those of the Ostrogothic Court of Theodoric the Great: it might conceivably have been Visigothic.

The Castilian story has more developed features. The King of Leon purchased a horse and a hawk from his vassal, Count Fernán González of Castile, for the sum of one thousand marks, but with the additional condition that, if the money were not paid on a fixed date, the value of the purchase should be doubled for each day. Three years' procrastination advanced the price of the animals higher than the King of Leon (or the King of France or the whole world!) could pay, so that he preferred to renounce his sovereignty over Castile. The differences between this story and that recorded in Jordanes lessen on further inspection. Professor C. C. Marden remarks, in his note on the passage, that the *Poema de Fernán González*, the *Crónica General*, the *Crónica de* 1344, the *Crónica Rimada* and the *Estoria del Conde Fernán González* (Toledo, 1511) use the pronouns *ello*, *lo* and *le* in the singular, as signifying the single idea *caballo y azor*. 'Parecen necesarias las correcciones *ellos* y *los*.' *Difficilior lectio potior*: the hawk may have been begotten by the demand for a second hemistich ('un mudado azor, e un azor en la mano,' etc.). Nor is this particular setting necessary to explain the working of geometrical progression or compound interest at 36,500 per cent., which can be done as well with the apologue of a mouse and grains of corn in a granary. On the other hand, the tribute of a horse

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

in admission of suzerainty, which is otherwise paralleled, affords a feasible basis for the fiction of a horse as redemption-value.

This suggestion has been made by Sr. Menéndez Pidal (*L'Epopée Castillane*, 1910, p. 54), whom I take the liberty of quoting:

> A ce propos il convient de rechercher ce qui a pu donner lieu à l'étrange épisode de la vente du cheval et de l'autour. Peut-être a-t-il une origine historique. Au Moyen-Age, le bénéficiaire d'une donation remettait au donateur un objet de mince valeur, pour imprimer à la donation l'indispensable caractère d'un échange, et c'est là ce que l'on nommait *corroboration*. Nombreux étaient les objets usuels employés dans cet acte: une paire de gants, un manteau, une certaine quantité de vin ou de blé, une mule, un cheval, un autour. Le cheval et l'autour réunis servent de gages de corroboration dans divers documents des Xe et XIe siècles, et nous pouvons supposer qu'ils servirent de même dans une donation, réelle ou apocryphe, par laquelle le roi de Léon aurait cédé à Fernand González divers droits sur le comté: d'où l'on put dire que le roi avait cédé le comté en échange d'un cheval et d'un autour.

This hypothesis and the one I now suggest are independent of each other, but they are not exclusive. On the contrary, nothing could be more probable than that it was a legal or historical circumstance which aided an inveterate tradition to connect itself with some particular name.

In suggesting a connexion between Gothic fables of the sixth century and Castilian of the tenth or twelfth, we find support in (1) the certainty that the Christian remnant of Spain was largely of the lineage of the Goths, and in (2) the possibility, as Sr. Menéndez Pidal has argued, that the *cantares de gesta* are a continuation of the tradition of the Gothic *cantiones*, for in both invaluable and primitive information is preserved *in priscis eorum carminibus pene storicu ritu* (Jordanes, *Get.* cap. iv).

There is, of course, not evidence enough to exclude other hypotheses or to raise this above mere possibility, but it is at any rate profitable to bring together what appear to be the only two uses of this particular saga-motif.

WILLIAM J. ENTWISTLE.

MANCHESTER.

A MISSING NAME IN GOETHE'S DIARY.

In Goethe's *Tagebücher*, under date Jan. 30, 1828, is the record of a visit in which the name of the visitor is left blank: 'Herr von..... Diplomat, von Wien über Dresden kommend, von neuerer deutscher Literatur sehr wohl unterrichtet.' In the 'Lesarten' of the Weimar edition the suggestion is made that this visitor might have been Peter von Piquot, at that time Minister-Resident in Vienna. Except that Piquot was known to Goethe there seems to be no ground for this conjecture, and a much more likely name would appear to be that of

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Friedrich Apollonius Freiherr von Maltitz. Maltitz was an attaché at the Russian Embassy in Vienna from 1826 to 1829 (cf. *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*) and visited Goethe in 1828. He wrote a short account of this visit for the *Abendzeitung* (Sept. 23, 1840, col. 1830 f.) under the heading '5 Minuten bei Goethe' (reprinted in Biedermann's *Goethe's Gespräche*, 2nd ed., IV, pp. 57 f.), in the course of which he gives some details of the conversation on literary topics and remarks: 'Mehreres was ich ihm von der literarischen Welt Wiens, das ich damals bewohnte, mitteilte, erregte seinen Antheil.' As the name Maltitz does not occur elsewhere in the diary for 1828 and would not fill any other blank so suitably, it seems most probable that it is the name omitted here by Goethe's amanuensis.

FRANCIS E. SANDBACH.

BIRMINGHAM.

Digitized by Google

Original from
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

REVIEWS.

The Elizabethan Stage. By E. K. CHAMBERS. 4 vols. Oxford: University Press, 1923. 8vo. Vol. I. pp. xliv + 388; vol. II. pp. 557; vol. III. pp. 518; vol. IV. pp. 467. £3. 10*s.*

With the appearance of Mr E. K. Chambers' four massive volumes covering in their entirety not only the history of the theatres and the companies in Elizabethan times but also the social background and the various surroundings of the playhouses, the study of the Elizabethan drama may well be said to have entered upon a new era. Not that Mr Chambers' work presents a great mass of novel and revolutionary material; most of the documents and all of the plays have been known to scholars for years past; but here for the first time we find gathered together practically all the available information for a survey of Elizabethan stage conditions, presented literally so that future investigators may form their own judgments and conclusions on the evidence, and commented upon in the light of Mr Chambers' own vast knowledge of the period.

In view of the fact that most of our knowledge of early drama comes from the association of that drama with the court, it is natural that Mr Chambers should open his first volume with a study of the lighter side of palace life in the reigns of Elizabeth and James, should pass from that to a survey of the royal household, of the working of the Revels Office, of pageantry and of the mask and of court festivities. Natural as this is, however, it tends slightly to obscure the definitely popular side of that dramatic development which finds a culmination in the tragedies, comedies and histories of Shakespeare. Associated though Shakespeare was with the court, his drama is not a court drama; its freshness, its healthiness and vitality tell of its intimate relationship with the common life of the people. For students of the drama, therefore, as distinct from students of the stage and of stage-spectacle, this insistence on the court may well lead towards a false perspective. From the court, Mr Chambers carries us to the eternal struggle between the forces of humanism, eager to take from the stage all it has to give of delight and of profit, and the forces of Puritanism, sourly intent only on the evils and disadvantages of the theatres. This chapter, along with Appendix C (Documents of Criticism), provides a masterly summary of Elizabethan and Jacobean views of the stage. The struggle for the control of the stage inevitably follows, supplemented by Appendix D (Documents of Control), and thereafter an examination of the status, social and financial, of the professional actor. Volume II is occupied entirely with the playhouses and the companies, and contains an invaluable list of actors with notes on their association with particular companies and on their personal history. Volume III deals with the staging of plays and provides

Digitized by Google

Original from
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

notes on the dramas of the time, while Volume IV contains the appendices of material on which much of the text is based.

Considering the length of this work, the accuracy of citation and reference is well-nigh miraculous. A minute examination of even the most closely packed pages reveals a painstaking attention to detail which renders this work a standard authority, a veritable encyclopaedia of reference. Occasionally, but very occasionally, a few errors are allowed to intrude. In one place, the dates of performance as given by Henslowe seem to be confused with the amended chronology put forward by Dr W. W. Greg in his edition of the 'Diary.' In another, it is stated that the theatre depicted in the frontispiece to *The Wits* has a tapering stage, as in the *Roxana* and *Messalina* engravings; if it is not intended to be rectangular, *The Wits* stage might be thought to taper backwards instead of to the front. Fundamentally, however, these volumes, in regard to accuracy, are flawless. The presentation of a certain amount of information has, of course, been debarred to Mr Chambers because of his boundary line set in 1616. This is particularly noticeable in his lists of actors and of dramas. One might have thought that Mr Chambers could here have extended his survey, for the players, to the close of their acting careers, and for the dramatists, to their last recorded works. It is, for example, somewhat confusing to read of a player such as Alexander Foster merely that he was in 'Lady Elizabeth's, 1611, 1618; Charles's, 1616,' and equally confusing to have the activity of dramatists whose work extended on both sides of the 1616 line severely truncated in full growth.

That portion of Mr Chambers' work which is most valuable, and will, as a consequence, excite most criticism, is the portion devoted to the much-debated principles of Elizabethan staging. For the first time we find a scholar sufficiently daring to dismiss the time-honoured idea of a 'typical Elizabethan stage' and to rely for his theories on that which is presented before him in the way of proof. We have had only too many of these fanciful 'typical' reconstructions in the past. Mr Chambers' position may here be briefly stated. He firmly believes in the historical method, and the great merit of his work is that he has endeavoured, as far as that might be possible, to classify the plays of the time under the various theatres wherein apparently they were first produced. The advance which this marks may hardly be expressed in words; it displays the modern method as opposed to the old; it shows the spirit of the scholar in opposition to that of the amateur. Secondly, Mr Chambers bases all his remarks on the De Witt drawing, the only representation of an Elizabethan stage extant. He retains in his reconstructed theatre the twin doors marked in this drawing, but presumes, as is necessary, the presence of an alcove between those two doors. This alcove, he conjectures, formed part of the tiring house proper, divided as the exigencies of plays required by movable screens. It may be noted here that Mr William Archer, who clings to the Godfrey reconstruction, in his review of *The Elizabethan Stage* in the *Quarterly*, completely misrepresents Mr Chambers' theories. The alcove for Mr Chambers is not a solid

Digitized by Google

Original from
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

box; the sides are removable for the introduction of set pieces such as beds, tables and perhaps chairs of state (although these may have descended, creaking, on to the outer stage through the heavens); entry to this alcove, therefore, might be made, not only from the front, but by the sides or from the back. The division of scenes in plays into open-country or threshold scenes, chamber scenes and large hall scenes, seems to be amply substantiated from the details presented.

The value of the historical method in dealing with this question of stage settings is most fully demonstrated by Mr Chambers' treatment of the court drama and of the seventeenth century plays. The changes that seem to have taken place in the use of the stage gallery and of the alcove are delicately handled; and Lyly's methods of display are fully dealt with. In this connexion, it is peculiar to note that Mr Chambers and Miss Lucy B. Campbell (in her *Scenes and Machines in the Renaissance*) have both independently stumbled on the importance of Serlio's *Trattato sopra le Scene* for any consideration of early stage theory.

In his study there are few important works of previous scholars which Mr Chambers, in this comprehensive analysis, has overlooked. It is strange, however, that he should have missed Professor Hillebrand's important article on *The Children of the King's Revels at Whitefriars* (contributed to *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology* for April 1922), an article which throws a mass of new light on the affairs of this short-lived but interesting company of 1607–8. No doubt the Public Record Office and other treasuries of documentary material will in the future reveal still further secrets concerning Elizabethan and Jacobean stage history; but, whatever is discovered, Mr Chambers' book, it would seem, can never become out of date. It is a work of permanent value, to be used for constant reference.

ALLARDYCE NICOLL.

LONDON.

The Shakespeare Canon. Parts I and II. By J. M. ROBERTSON. London: George Routledge and Sons. 1922, 1923. xvi + 205 pp. and xx + 216 pp. 12*s.* 6*d.* each.

Mr Robertson here continues his enquiries into the authenticity of the plays published in the first Shakespeare folio, those discussed in Part I of this work being *Henry V*, *Julius Caesar* and *Richard III*. The methods of investigation are similar to those adopted in the volumes he has already devoted to *Titus Andronicus* and *Hamlet*, and the studies of *Timon of Athens* and other plays in *Shakespeare and Chapman*. First the 'general tests of metrics, style and treatment' are applied to each piece to ascertain whether it is the work of Shakespeare, and then, if the result of these tests is to impugn it either wholly or in part, a solution of the authorship of the suspected portions is sought in 'marks of phrase, idea, vocabulary and diction which point to contemporaries who may be shown to be likely sharers in the challenged performance.'

Applying his tests to these three plays, Mr Robertson is led to the

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

conclusion that *Henry V* and *Julius Caesar* were drafted by Marlowe in collaboration with others and afterwards revised by Shakespeare, and that *Richard III* is, as it stands, substantially Marlowe's play, containing only a few speeches altered or interpolated by Shakespeare and some additions by a later hand, probably Heywood's.

There is, of course, nothing inherently improbable in Mr Robertson's theories concerning these plays, since it is beyond doubt that certain of the 'canonical' plays are not wholly Shakespeare's and that in some cases he has adapted and altered the work of other men, either completely recasting an earlier play as in *King John* or, as in *The Taming of the Shrew*, not only borrowing incidents from it but boldly incorporating in his text portions of its dialogue. From what we know of Shakespeare's methods, we may, indeed, be pretty sure that if Marlowe or Kyd or another *had* written a play about Henry V or Julius Caesar, Shakespeare would have made use of it, and the arguments adduced by Mr Robertson in support of the belief that Shakespeare's *Henry V* and *Julius Caesar* are in fact based upon, and retain portions of the texts of, such earlier plays therefore deserve careful consideration.

It is in his endeavour to make out a case for the Marlovian origin of *Henry V* that Mr Robertson is least successful. The whole spirit of the play, and especially the robust patriotism that pervades it, is clearly distasteful to him—so distasteful, one feels, as to render him incapable of judging it temperately. The king's exhortation of his subjects at the beginning of Act III:

> Once more unto the breach, dear friends, once more,

—which has surely stirred the blood of a good many generations of Englishmen—to him is merely 'the first rant before Harfleur.' Nor does the Agincourt speech (IV, i) please him any better. 'Eloquent without intensity, sentimentally lyrical, and notably reiterative,' it is, he says, 'more markedly in the style of Peele than almost anything in the play,' and we are told that the line:

> We few, we happy few, we band of brothers,

'recalls a dozen of Peele's in *Anglorum Feriæ* and elsewhere.' One can only reply to this that a critic may have an intimate knowledge of Peele's work and yet find it impossible to believe that he could have written this speech, or one bearing any appreciable resemblance to it.

Mr Robertson has much that is interesting to say of the weaknesses of the play, its faults of construction, the varying quality of its style and contradictory presentations of the character of the king, but the argument based on these defects—that it is in substance pre-Shakespearean—would carry more weight if he were less free in his denunciation of the play. It is not only that most readers will fail to see in it the 'turgid repetition,' 'fatuous exultation,' 'unctuous ethic' and 'feculent panegyric' of which Mr Robertson speaks, but that some of his statements are demonstrably inaccurate, as, for instance, that it contains 'much weak repetition' of *The Famous Victories of Henry V*, whereas in fact it borrows very little from the old play and contains nothing that can fairly

Digitized by Google Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

be described as 'weak repetition' of that play. And the cautious critic will not only be on his guard against 'the power of tradition to narcotize the aesthetic sense' but against conjectures which may, as the late Sir Walter Raleigh says, be 'vitiated by the superstition which refuses to assign to Shakespeare any hasty or careless work.'

When the evidence in favour of the pre-Shakespeareans named by Mr Robertson is examined, it will be found altogether unsatisfactory. Indeed, so far as Marlowe, the supposed originator of the play, is concerned, apart from a good parallel between a passage in III, iii of *Henry V* and one in *Dido, Queen of Carthage*, no really intimate resemblance to Marlowe's diction is shown to exist. And Shakespeare's claims do not appear to have been sufficiently considered. Take for instance the first prologue, which on metrical evidence is pronounced pre-Shakespearean. To Mr Robertson it suggests Dekker because it bears some resemblance to the prologue of Act II of *Old Fortunatus*—a general resemblance such as is also presented by the prologues and choruses of other Elizabethan plays. The lines:

> Can this cockpit hold
> The vasty walls of France: or may we cram
> Within this wooden O the very casque
> That did affright the air at Agincourt?

are compared with Dekker's:

> The world to the circumference of Heaven
> Is as a small point in geometry,
> Whose greatness is so little that a less
> Cannot be made: into that narrow room
> Your quick imaginations we must charm,

but does the similarity here raise a presumption in favour of Dekker as against Shakespeare, who elsewhere speaks of 'the vasty wilds of wide Arabia' and of 'that little O, the earth'? It is suggested that some of these *Henry V* prologues are primarily Marlowe's, that another may be by Dekker or Heywood, and yet another by Peele, but, when one turns from Mr Robertson's arguments to the prologues themselves, there seems little to raise a doubt that all are from the same pen, still less to justify the assumption that any of the dramatists named had a hand in one of them.

That a play presenting the death of Julius Caesar was on the stage long before Shakespeare's is almost certain. There are lines in Greene's *Orlando Furioso* and again in Peele's *Alphonsus, Emperor of Germany*, which, as Mr Robertson points out, are scarcely susceptible of explanation except as allusions to a Julius Caesar play then current, a play dating back to Marlowe's lifetime. And as there is a good deal in our *Julius Caesar* suggestive of Marlowe, perhaps more than one would expect in a Shakespearean play of so late a date as the 1598 or 1599 usually assigned to it, it is not unreasonable to suppose that the passages suggestive of Marlowe are due not merely to Marlowe's influence but to his very hand. But that the play contains as much of Marlowe's work as Mr Robertson affirms it is difficult to believe. He will not even allow

Digitized by Google

Original from
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Mark Antony's oration to be Shakespeare's, though admitting that it is 'impossible to say that its style is markedly Marlowese' or that 'its diction points clearly to any other known hand.' Surely, then, there is no sufficient ground for seeking to deprive Shakespeare of a speech so subtly phrased and so splendidly dramatic, perhaps the most masterly piece of rhetoric to be found in any of the plays that bear his name.

There was a time when Mr Robertson assured us that his critical examination of the Shakespearean texts need raise no instinctive opposition or feeling of alarm in the minds of lovers of Shakespeare, since his attempts to eliminate the work that is not Shakespeare's touched none but inferior work and called in question no really great speech. Yet here, in *The Shakespeare Canon*, the king's speech before Agincourt in *Henry V*, Mark Antony's oration in *Julius Caesar* and Clarence's dream in *Richard III* are all attributed to another hand. And, to come now to Clarence's dream, why, if it be not Shakespeare's, are we 'bound' to assign it to Marlowe? Has not Kyd as good a claim? Mr Robertson seems to have overlooked its remarkable similarity to the dream of Arden in *Arden of Feversham*. It is thus that Clarence concludes the account of his dream:

> *With that*, methought, a legion of foul fiends
> Environ'd me and howlèd in mine ears
> Such hideous cries, that *with the very noise*
> *I trembling wak'd*, and for a season after
> Could not believe but that I was in hell,
> *Such terrible impression made my dream*,

and thus Arden:

> *With that* he blew an evil-sounding horn
> And *at the noise* another herdman came
> With falchion drawn, and bent it at my breast,
> Crying aloud 'Thou art the game we seek!'
> *With this I wak'd and trembled* every joint,
> .....when I did awake,
> I stood in doubt whether I waked or no:
> *Such great impression took this fond surprise.*

Resemblances less close than this have been cited by Mr Robertson as indicating either community of authorship or servile imitation. That the parallel will inspire in him any doubt of Marlowe's responsibility for the *Richard III* speech is, however, improbable. Although he holds that *Arden of Feversham* is 'primarily' Kyd's, he will tell us that the passage quoted is one of Marlowe's contributions to that play, or perhaps that it is by Greene, here obviously imitating the Clarence speech in Marlowe's *Richard III*; for it is one of Mr Robertson's peculiarities that he is never content to assign a play to one author, seldom indeed to less than three.

In Part II the plays discussed are *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, *Richard II*, *The Comedy of Errors* and *Measure for Measure*. *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* Mr Robertson ascribes to Greene, Shakespeare's hand in his opinion being traceable only in the first scene; *Richard II* and *The Comedy of Errors* he believes to be (like *Richard III*) sub-

Digitized by Google

Original from
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

stantially Marlowe's, the existing texts representing Shakespearean revisions of older Marlovian plays, while *Measure for Measure* is fathered on Chapman—it is a 'working recast' by Shakespeare of a play of Chapman's drafting.

In all these studies, as in those in Part I, one finds much skilful argumentation, but little evidence. In the first chapter of the essay on *The Two Gentlemen* ('Doubt and Dogmatism'), Mr Robertson has no difficulty in showing that many contradictory opinions have been pronounced upon it by eminent critics. Hanmer's doubt that Shakespeare was concerned in it otherwise than in 'enlivening it with some speeches and lines thrown in here and there' is set against Malone's surprise that it should ever have been a question 'that this comedy was the genuine and entire composition of Shakespeare.' Malone, however, admitted that 'imitation of a preceding celebrated dramatist' was to be seen in 'some of the lower dialogues.' Mr Robertson thinks that Greene was the dramatist Malone had in mind, and, following hard upon animadversions on the 'over-emphasis' of the 'blank asseverations' of Blackstone, Ritson and others, we come to his own uncompromising assertion:

> If, believing the play to be wholly or mainly of Shakespeare's writing, we are to be honest about the 'imitation' revealed in it, we must say that he servilely copied Greene in phrase, in *gnomai*, in machinery, in vocabulary, in ethic, in farce, in style, and above all in versification, from the moment the first scene-section is passed.

To this, borrowing Mr Robertson's own words, we must 'patiently but firmly reply' that a belief in the authenticity of the play involves no such admission. Even Mr Robertson allows that there is one difficulty in accepting it as Greene's,—the percentage of double-endings, higher here than in any play published under his name. It is interesting to notice how this difficulty is met. 'The natural assumption' is that Greene 'did not lend himself to the mode in question,' but 'there are sufficient grounds for believing that he did.' What are these sufficient grounds? They are these: that it is known that Greene wrote many plays besides those that have survived, that 'the example of Marlowe's multiplication of the double-ending was bound to be finally as persuasive for him as it obviously was for Kyd' and the carrying of the device to the extent shown in this play is 'quite in keeping with his general exuberance'! Perhaps it is. But what, then, is the value of these metrical tests, of which so much use is made by Mr Robertson elsewhere, if their evidence is thus to be brushed aside whenever it is convenient to disregard it, and what faith does Mr Robertson expect us to put in the confident assertion (at the conclusion of this essay) that the ascription to Greene is borne out by 'every kind of internal test'?

Much is made of the presence in *The Two Gentlemen* of phrases and sentiments that may be found in Greene's plays or poems; nothing at all of its obvious relations with *Romeo and Juliet* and *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. The palpable resemblance between Valentine's and Romeo's speeches on the 'torment' or 'torture' of banishment should not, in Mr Robertson's opinion, raise any presumption that Valentine's speech is

Digitized by Google

Original from
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Shakespeare's. 'The more just reflection would be that the marked repetition is in itself un-Shakespearean, and that at least one of the speeches is presumptively not his; though some will doubtless adhere to the view of the poet as spontaneously repeating himself in that fashion.' 'The Imitation Theory,' we are told, 'inevitably involves the notion of the imitator chronically imitating himself...rational criticism delivers us from both forms of belittlement; though it should be specially satisfactory to know that Shakespeare was not a slavish parodist of Greene.' It is not easy to know what we are to understand from this: presumably it is that the only inference open to the rational critic is that neither Valentine's nor Romeo's speech is Shakespeare's. But whatever conclusion is drawn as to their authorship, surely no critic but Mr Robertson will regard either of these speeches as a 'slavish parody' of the other?

I do not find that in any of these studies Mr Robertson has made out a plausible case. The longest, and perhaps the best, of the papers in Part II is that on *Richard II*. The earlier part of this paper, the discussion of the 'Un-Shakespearean Aspects' of the play and of the considerations pointing to the conclusion that its inception was not due to Shakespeare, contains little that will arouse violent dissent and may well dispose the open-minded reader to give an attentive hearing to Mr Robertson's advocacy of Marlowe's claims. But even if Mr Robertson manages to inspire in him doubts of Shakespeare's authorship, he will be easy to persuade if Mr Robertson convinces him that Marlowe wrote it. If, with Mr Robertson, he finds that the occurrence in the acknowledged works of Marlowe of eight out of thirty-six 'once used' words raises a strong presumption in Marlowe's favour, and that the presence of nine (by no means remarkable) 'coincidences of phrase' justifies the assertion that a belief in Shakespeare's authorship is only tenable on the assumption that Shakespeare was an impotent imitator 'maniacally mimicking the model of the moment,' he will be converted, but not otherwise.

The most striking feature of the paper on *The Comedy of Errors* is the chapter entitled 'Marlowe and Comedy,' in which a vigorous attempt is made to revive the old claims put forward on behalf of Marlowe to the verse parts of the old *Taming of a Shrew*, now almost universally rejected. Most modern critics find it inconceivable that Marlowe should have written a play full of literal repetitions of passages from his previous plays, since, judging from his known work, such slavish repetition (notwithstanding Mr Robertson's statement that 'it was the kind of thing he was constantly doing') is entirely foreign to his methods. Moreover the style of the blank verse of *A Shrew* is indistinguishable from that of the verse parts of *Wily Beguiled*, in which are embedded lines extracted not from Marlowe's works but from Kyd's. There is strong internal evidence that the verse of these two plays is from one hand, and, if this be the case, it is impossible that the hand can be Marlowe's.

In the course of his discussion of these Shakespearean plays Mr Robertson makes many other questionable attributions of plays other than Shakespeare's. *Selimus*, attributed by Crawford to Marlowe, he

Digitized by Google Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

assigns to Greene, to whom certain extracts from the play are credited in *England's Parnassus*. Undoubtedly there is much in *Selimus* to remind us of Greene, but there is much also to remind us of Marlowe, and it has also many features suggestive of Kyd, and not a few that recall Peele. On the whole the most likely hypothesis would seem to be that it is by none of them, but the work of an imitator. At any rate it is pretty clear that neither Greene nor Marlowe can have written the play as it stands, for it contains lines copied from Kyd's *Cornelia*, which, from the wording of the author's dedication to the Countess of Sussex, appears to have been written at the end of 1593, when both Greene and Marlowe were in their graves. Of *Edward III* Mr Robertson writes that it was 'visibly begun and planned by Marlowe, expanded in the Countess scenes by Greene, and shared in certainly by Kyd, and probably by Peele.' Is it really possible to identify the styles of four authors in this play, to discriminate between the style of Marlowe and the styles of his contemporaries and imitators?

This brings me to what Mr Robertson has to say of the 'style test' in enquiries as to the authorship of anonymous or doubtfully assigned plays. He objects that other critics (myself among them) disregard this test, and are thus led to false conclusions. Were there any scientific method of testing an author's style, as apart from his versification and vocabulary, no doubt it ought to be applied. But unfortunately there is not. What Mr Robertson calls his 'style test' seems to amount to nothing more than the affirmation that such and such a passage is in the style of Marlowe, or Peele or another. He makes no allowance for the fact that an author does not always write in the same style, that different styles do not necessarily imply different authors. There is an interesting case in point in his remarks concerning *Alphonsus, Emperor of Germany*, in the preface to the first volume of *The Shakespeare Canon*. He was, I believe, the first to point out that this play shows unmistakable signs of Peele's hand, but added that the style of the opening scene was not Peele's, and suggested Marlowe, or Greene imitating Marlowe. An independent examination of the play satisfied me that the ascription to Peele was justified, and the discovery in the first scene of a striking parallel with a passage in Peele's *David and Bethsabe* led me to assert that it was in this very scene that Peele's hand was most conspicuous. Here is the passage in *Alphonsus, Emperor of Germany* (from the soliloquy of Alphonsus with which the play opens):

> So I, not muffled in simplicity,
> Zealous indeed of nothing but my good,
> Haste to the augur of my happiness
> To lay the ground of my ensuing wars.
> He learns his wisdom, not by flight of birds,
> By prying into sacrificèd beasts,
> By hares that cross the way, by howling wolves,
> By gazing on the starry element,
> Or vain imaginary calculations;
> But from a settled wisdom in itself,
> Which teacheth to be void of passion,

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

and here, in Peele's *David and Bethsabe* (Scene xv of Bullen's edition) is David addressing Solomon:

> The feeble eyes of our aspiring thoughts
> Behold things present, and record things past:
> But things to come exceed our human reach,
> .....
> For those, submit thy sense, and say—'Thou power,
> That now art framing of the future world,
> Know'st all to come, not by the course of heaven,
> By frail conjectures of inferior signs,
> By monstrous floods, by flights and flocks of birds,
> By bowels of a sacrificèd beast,
> Or by the figures of some hidden art;
> But by a true and natural presage,
> Laying the ground and perfect architect
> Of all our actions now before thine eyes....'

What inference should be drawn from this parallel? Surely, as elsewhere in *Alphonsus* we find unmistakable traces of Peele's hand, the natural inference is that this scene is also his. No, says Mr Robertson,—'One result of this method' (the failure to apply the style test) 'is that Mr Sykes credits to Peele the first scene in *Alphonsus* because Peele copies a passage from it in *David and Bethsabe*.' And, again in Part I (p. 110), he says 'The style test would seem clearly to show that the opening scene, a passage of which is closely echoed in Peele's *David and Bethsabe*, is Marlowe's. It is, moreover, in Marlowe's later manner, and the play must therefore be dated after 1590.' And in Part II he speaks still more positively, affirming that in the *David and Bethsabe* passage

> we have plagiarism pure and simple, by one who could not hope to rival his copy. The soliloquy in *Alphonsus* is written with the very fling and line-movement, the easy vigorous expatiation of Marlowe positing one of his self-declared villains.... There are, as has been admitted, many passages as to which we may reasonably doubt whether they are Marlowe's or an imitator's. The passage before us is one as to which that doubt, in our view, cannot arise for a student who recognizes the marks of a style, of an outstanding manner and personality.

Now, as it happens, there is conclusive evidence that Peele is *not* imitating the *Alphonsus* passage in *David and Bethsabe*, and that Marlowe has nothing whatever to do with the matter. Mr Robertson does not recognize the style of this first scene of *Alphonsus* as Peele's, because Peele's style is here influenced by Du Bartas. The speech of David in *David and Bethsabe* is a close paraphrase of Adam's address to Seth in *La Seconde Semaine* of Du Bartas ('Les Artifices,' 1 Jour, Livre IV):

> Mon fils (respond Adam) l'œil de nostre pensée
> Voit la chose presente, et revoit la passée:
> Nous cele qui nous suit, si, rendu plus qu'humain,
> Il ne la lit au front du Trois-fois-Souverain.
> Toy donq qui seul cognois toutes choses futures,
> Non par le cours du ciel, par foibles conjectures,
> Par les poincts accouplez, par le vol des oiseaux,
> Ou par le tremblement des consultez boyaux:
> Ains d'une prescience et certaine et parfaite,
> Comme estant du futur l'Agent et le Profète.
>
> *La Seconde Semaine*, 1584, sig. N. ii.

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

In both plays Peele is echoing Du Bartas, closely in *David and Bethsabe* (which contains much other matter from 'Les Artifices') and more distantly in *Alphonsus*.

This, of course, does not show that Mr Robertson is wrong in his conclusion that these plays of the Shakespeare folio, usually regarded as wholly Shakespeare's, are of composite authorship. But it does show that it is an extremely hazardous proceeding to attribute a play to more hands than one because its style is not homogeneous.

There is one other pronouncement concerning the authorship of a non-Shakespearean play which should not be allowed to pass unchallenged. On the strength of its ascription to Heywood by the late Rupert Brooke, Mr Robertson speaks of *Appius and Virginia* as 'absurdly assigned to Webster,' and so convinced is he that Heywood was its author that he makes use of its vocabulary to substantiate his theory that Heywood had a reviser's hand in *Richard III*. But, notwithstanding Brooke's statements to the contrary, *Appius and Virginia* shows abundant internal evidence of Webster's workmanship. Its author does indeed borrow many words from Heywood, but Webster was an inveterate borrower and his part of *A Cure for a Cuckold* also contains a number of words that are all but peculiar to Heywood. This Brooke failed to notice, overlooking also the highly significant fact that, like most other Webster plays, *Appius and Virginia* has passages derived from Sidney's *Arcadia* and Florio's translation of Montaigne's essays. Moreover there are in one scene alone of *Appius and Virginia* more close parallels with Webster's other works than Rupert Brooke was able to find in the whole play. It is impossible to go into the evidence here, but those who trust to the title-page ascription may rest satisfied that in so doing they run no risk of being convicted of absurdity.

Nevertheless, whatever doubts one may have of the accuracy of Mr Robertson's conclusions, or the validity of the arguments upon which they are based, it would be idle to deny the value of the searching examination to which he has subjected the texts of these Shakespearean plays. Both these volumes of *The Shakespeare Canon* are full of acute and illuminative criticism, and every Shakespearean student—even the most orthodox—will do well to read them.

H. DUGDALE SYKES.

ENFIELD.

Cavalier and Puritan. Ballads and Broadsides illustrating the Period of the Great Rebellion, 1640–1660. Edited with an Introduction and Notes by HYDER E. ROLLINS. New York: New York University Press. 1923. 8vo. xv + 532 pp. ii pl. $6.50.

An Analytical Index to the Ballad-entries (1557–1709) *in the Registers of the Company of Stationers of London.* Compiled by HYDER E. ROLLINS. (*Studies in Philology*, vol. XXI, No. 1, Jan. 1924.) $3.00.

Digitized by Google

Original from
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Professor Rollins continues his series of selections from ballad-literature. His *Old English Ballads* and *Pepysian Garland* carried him up to 1640, and in the present volume he covers the next twenty eventful years. It is a considerable improvement at any rate on the first of its predecessors, which fell to the present writer to review in *M.L.R.* It has a much better defined scope, and by concentrating on a period and arranging the ballads by dates (drawn mostly from the *Stationers' Register*) the editor has succeeded very well in tracing the movements of the incessant war which raged between the Government and the Royalist ballad writers. This he draws out in a substantial historical introduction.

Not that political ballads form the substance of the book. Professor Rollins is here, as in his previous volumes, eclectic, and illustrates his period by all kinds of pieces. Besides abusive poems on Cromwell's nose there are journalistic ballads on such public affairs as the hangings of witches and highwaymen, and on the death of Parnel the Quaker, attacks on Anabaptists and Atheists (one of the latter, in no. 37, had a singular cure for matrimony), complaints of the excise on beer (a modern touch this) and the usual cheerful dialogues between country lovers. The editor indeed claims that the modern reader will find as much significance in this last class as in the political, and he is right: but his instance, 'A kiss of a Seaman's worth two of another' (no. 60) is to my mind far less valuable than no. 61:

> A merry new song of the wooing there was
> Twixt a zealous young man, and a Cavalier Lasse,
> He woos (and would wed) she will have no such thing,
> Unlesse she may married be with a Ring,
> Have Ribbons, and Gloves, Rosemary, and Bayes,
> And all things that were in her fore-Fathers dayes.

A considerable number of corrections of detail might be made in text and glossary. Thus on p. 377, the editor takes 'again replied' to mean 'replied a second time,' and supposes a lost stanza to contain the first reply! And in notes which take account of commas in the text we miss some more substantial emendations, such as 'a loyall heart' for 'a royall heart' on p. 258, *l. penult.*, and 'to quaffe *Lyeus* bloud' for 'to quaffe *Lyens* bloud,' on p. 170, l. 2. And a quantity of entries in the glossary seem to be intended for readers unacquainted with the English tongue. Who needs to be told that a groat is 'a fourpenny coin,' that 'undone' means 'ruined,' or 'banded' 'united as in a band'? Cicester, moreover, is Cirencester, not Chichester (a pardonable error), and Charles I's Bishop of London was Juxon, not Jaxon (p. 81 *n.*).

The book is beautifully printed by W. E. Rudge of Mount Vernon, but the ink, which is perfect in the text, seems almost too black and shiny (a rare complaint) on the many zincograph blocks of the old wood-cuts—a feature of the book which should have been mentioned before; also I deplore the tiresome new would-be-practical habit of omitting printer's signatures, especially as the unpaged cuts throw the normal sequence of pages out. The paper is of a make unfamiliar to me and deserves a word of praise to itself.

Digitized by Google

Original from
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

In the second work entered above Professor Rollins has put at everyone's disposal an instrument of reference which he probably was driven to make in the first place for his own use; it consists of indices of titles, first lines, persons and subjects treated in the licensed ballads of the whole period for which the Stationers' Registers are in print.

A. ESDAILE.

LONDON.

Le Roman et les Idées en Angleterre. L'Influence de la Science (1860–1890). Par MADELEINE L. CAZAMIAN. London: H. Milford, 1923. ix + 484 pp. 8*s*. 6*d*.

Pursuing the line of research struck out by her eminent namesake, the author of *Le Roman Social en Angleterre*, 1830–50, Mlle M. L. Cazamian offers us the very solid and well-documented first part of a study of the influence of 'Ideas' on the English novel of 1860–90. The term may be thought perilously vague. For the purpose of the present volume, indeed, it is ostensibly limited to one class of ideas—those derived from 'science.' But it is evident that no searching and comprehensive study of the fortunes of 'scientific' ideas in any creative intelligence can be carried through without taking account of the whole intellectual milieu upon which they work, and surveying all the other 'ideas' which have a lodgment there, and with which they have to make terms. And so Mlle Cazamian, in virtue of her very thoroughness, is unable to treat George Eliot or Samuel Butler without discussing at large their religion and social ideas; or Gissing without dwelling on 'the dilemma of women' and 'the struggle of the people towards the light'; or Mrs Ward without enlarging on 'the tragedy of doubt'; or Hardy without explaining the significance in his novels of 'evil' in man and in society. The trouble is, of course, that precisely in this period 'science,' particularly the doctrine of evolution, reacted upon every branch of contemporary thought.

In the opening chapter the unmistakable changes of temper and outlook which mark the years about 1860 are ably set forth. The work of Dickens, radiant with humour and sentiment but poor in ideas, was virtually done; that of George Eliot and Meredith, where both organized philosophic conviction and the dialectic play of thought bore a part unexampled in any previous English novels of comparable power, had just begun. Successive sections trace the different aspects of this 'intellectualism,'—the spread of scientific ideas, the allusions (growingly respectful) to science in the novel, and the concurrent advance in realism—in England as in France a related phenomenon, *Adam Bede* being almost contemporary with *Madame Bovary*—preparing the way a little later for the 'Naturalism' of Zola and (with whatever qualifications) of Gissing. Four chapters follow, devoted to a detailed appreciation, as representatives of the 'scientific' aspect of intellectualism in the novel, of George Eliot, Samuel Butler, Gissing, and Hardy; while a fifth

Digitized by Google

Original from
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

('Pessimism in the Novel') is interposed between the earlier and the later pair, preluding the profounder more sustained tragedy of Gissing's and Hardy's world. These chapters, addressed to French readers, reproduce the stories with a degree of detail somewhat foreign to the purpose of the thesis; but the analyses are very good, and the grouping of successive phases in the several careers, as marked by the novels, is carried out with great skill and insight. The Gissing section acquires independent value from data furnished to the writer by Mme Fleury-Gissing. The chapter on 'Pessimism in the Novel,' 1875–1900, surveys a mass of literature, much of it now obsolescent; 'tragedies of doubt' like *Robert Elsmere*, or of aggressive 'unbelief' like Reade's *The Outcast*, Lucas Malet's *The Wages of Sin*, and Grant Allen's *The Woman who Did*; and the tragedies of social degradation, such as the *Mean Streets* of Morrison. We trust that this thorough and able piece of literary history may be translated.

C. H. Herford.

Manchester.

An Enquiry on a Psychological Basis into the Use of the Progressive Form in Late Modern English. Door Jacobus van der Laan. Gorinchem, 1922. vi + 138 pp.

This is such a careful and elaborate piece of work; it shows so thorough a knowledge of the English tongue and is so full of acute observation, that I hardly like to say that it is wrongheaded from beginning to end, and yet so it certainly seems to me. The author has got together a very large number of examples of the use of the so-called 'progressive' form ('I am walking,' 'I was walking' etc.) in modern English, and has attempted to analyse its exact force in each case and to show why this form of the verb is used rather than the simple tense form ('I walk,' 'I walked'). He has come to the conclusion that in these progressive forms there is always implied a certain quality of direct observation or conscious attention which is absent when the other form is used. Now it is perfectly true that if one examines a large number of examples of the use of the progressive form one will find in a great proportion of them at least a suggestion of direct observation and that in many other cases one can, by the exercise of a little dexterity, explain the usage on similar lines. But if I am not mistaken one can find just as much direct observation in many cases where the simple form is used. Dr van der Laan's opening paragraph runs 'In "a weeping child" and "the child is weeping" we record the result of *direct observation*.' But surely there is no more direct observation in 'the child is weeping' than, for example, in 'the child looks sad.' No, I cannot but think that the real distinction in the use of these forms is a less subtle matter than this and that the chief difficulty in understanding it arises from our habit of massing together everything, written and spoken, from the beginning of the nineteenth century, or even earlier, to the present day under some such

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

designation as Late Modern English, and then trying to find or devise rules which are applicable to all cases. In regard to the point under discussion in the book before us the usages of the language have changed rapidly, but if we take the absolutely modern language, the language in which we should discuss motor cars or broadcasting, we shall, I believe, find that the practice is, on the whole, simple and consistent, though quite different from what it was at the beginning of the nineteenth century.

One very important fact, obvious as it is, seems often to be neglected by writers on grammar, namely that figurative or poetical language tends to archaism. In the case which we are considering, this by itself is often sufficient to explain the use of a simple form where we might expect the progressive. Thus 'my heart bleeds for [him]' quoted by Dr van der Laan from R. L. Stevenson, is quite a possible form to-day, indeed the natural one if one uses the expression at all; but one says 'my nose is bleeding' when this is actually happening ('bleeds' is only possible when there is no limitation of time, as in 'my nose bleeds very easily'). Or take another of Dr van der Laan's examples, 'The moon halts opposite the window at which I sit.' Dr van der Laan perceives that according to the usual rules for the employment of the progressive tense one should say 'is halting,' but he does not apparently see that the real reason why the author did not use this form is because the statement was not meant to be understood as describing an actual occurrence. It is a bit of literary embroidery and naturally takes on the slightly archaic form proper to such things. Had the moon been, say, a troop of cavalry, the phrase used would not have been 'halts' but either 'is halting' or, seeing that the operation of halting is practically momentary and would probably be completed before the observer's interest allowed him to speak, 'has halted.'

No good can come of trying to find an explanation to fit all cases when the usage is so evidently changing. At all periods grammatical usage is complicated by the influence of false analysis and irregular survivals, and an irrational custom often gets the upper hand of logic, but when once we recognize these disturbing influences and how they work differently in different states of language and even when the subject-matter differs, explanation may perhaps be not altogether impossible. The use of the progressive forms has not yet been satisfactorily worked out, but I fear that Dr van der Laan's book, useful as it may be as a collection of examples, will not help us greatly towards a satisfactory solution.

R. B. McKerrow.
London.

Das Rolandslied. Herausgegeben von Eugen Lerch. (*Romanische Bücherei*, Bd 1.) Munich: Max Hueber. 1923. 173 pp.

The object of this new edition of the *Chanson de Roland* is to provide students with a readable copy of the Oxford manuscript accompanied

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

only by such emendations or variations as are absolutely necessary for the understanding of the text. Herr Lerch has attempted in this edition to combine the advantages of a diplomatic text and a critical edition and has happily reversed the process of Stengel who, in his love of restoration, so arranged his edition that virtually the whole of the Oxford MS. has to be sought in the notes.

The only actual alterations which Herr Lerch has permitted himself in the text are (1) to transpose letters which have obviously been 'verschrieben' by the scribe, (2) to supply, in italics, words (or syllables) which the copyist has omitted clearly by a slip, (3) to enclose in square brackets words or syllables which are obviously superfluous, (4) to enclose in round brackets whatever has been added by a later hand. If it has been added and is clearly wrong it is enclosed in round and square brackets, e.g. *gr*[(*a*)]*ant*, l. 1773. This latter process is clumsy and perhaps scarcely necessary. Even Professor Bédier (whose edition by the way, Herr Lerch does not seem to know), in spite of his respect for the Oxford manuscript, permits himself to write *grant*, and to correct 'des fautes serviles, fausses lectures ou erreurs de la plume.' Otherwise the text seems to us excellent and not embarrassed by the many exclamatory marks, etc. which disfigured that of Gröber in the *Bibliotheca Romanica*.

The footnotes which accompany the text seem to us useful as embodying the most reliable suggestions or possible alterations which have been made to elucidate passages in which the Oxford reading is clearly a 'contre-sens,' or rendered unlikely by a gross breach of metrical laws. The text is followed by a glossary which the author describes as 'provisorisch' in view of the definitive one which he proposes to embody in a future volume of the *Romanische Texte*. The value of the vocabulary is lessened by the absence of references to the passage or passages in which each word occurs, but this would perhaps have rendered the glossary too unwieldy for a text in such small compass as this series offers.

JESSIE CROSLAND.

LONDON.

The French Metrical Versions of Barlaam and Josaphat, with especial reference to the Terminations in Gui de Cambrai. By EDWARD C. ARMSTRONG. (*Elliott Monographs*, X.) Princeton, N.J.: Princeton Univ. Press. 1922. 8vo. 103 pp. $2.50.

Three Old French metrical versions of the *Historia de Vitis et Rebus gestis Sanctorum Barlaam Erimitae et Josaphat Regis Indorum* have come down to us: the summarised version of the Anglo-Norman *Chardri*, ed. by J. Koch, 1879; an anonymous Northern French version, 'the most faithful of the interpretations' (Armstrong, p. 2), unedited; and the much freer rendering of *Gui de Cambrai*, ed. by Meyer and Zotenberg, 1864, by Appel, Halle, 1907.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

It is with Gui's work that this monograph is mainly concerned. On the identity of Gui's patrons, and on the extant form of the poem, Mr Armstrong presents interesting and very probable suggestions based on a careful and perspicacious study of the poem and contemporary documents. 1. The patrons of the work, the Gilles de Marquais and his wife Marie, are in all probability the Gilles, lord of Marquais in Vermendois, second of the name, born c. 1170, a vavassour holding from the lord of Athies and Marie de Haplaincourt. 2. The emphasis Gui lays on the loyalty shown by Gilles for his overlord may find an explanation in the local conditions that obtained at the time of the battle of Bouvines (cf. p. 41). 3. The work, as we have it, is not as Gui de Cambrai wrote it. The bitter, personal attacks on the upper classes of society and contemporary leaders in church and state, including the Pope, are very probably to be ascribed to a remanieur, who is also responsible both for the end of the work that appears to have been left unfinished by Gui, and for the transference of the greater part of the prefatory dedication to the end of the poem. This remanieur may possibly be a Cistercian of the abbey of Vaucelles (p. 30), but this, as Mr Armstrong is careful to point out, is only a 'vague conjecture.'

The two editions of Gui's work are based on the two complete extant MSS. (Paris and Monte Cassino). Bound into a sixteenth-century translation of the *Homilies of St John* (MS. 1215 of the Bibliothèque Royale de Belgique), fragments of a third MS. have been discovered, and these are published by Mr Armstrong *in extenso* in the appendix of his monograph. The short account of the orthographical divergencies of these fragments that is given on page 13 shows that the North-Eastern linguistic traits must have been rather more strongly marked here than they were in the previously known MSS., but in all three MSS. the readings and spellings conform very closely and thus supply an indication of the rather narrowly local popularity of Gui's work (cf. p. 14). It is a small matter, but in Mr Armstrong's discussion of the linguistic traits (p. 13) I would venture to question the applicability of the term *off-glide* to the *i* in the words: *boin, boine, euist, deuist.* In the verb forms this *i* is stressed, and the forms in question are the normal unrounded forms that these terminations retain in the North-East of France (cf. Suchier, *Zeitschr. f. roman. Phil.*, II, p. 258). The forms *boin*, *boine*, pronounced presumably *bu̯ẽn*, *bu̯ẽne*, are probably due to a thirteenth-century confusion of spelling, which arose from the fact that the earlier diphthongs *ūe* and *oī + nasal* had both become *u̯ẽ*, and that *oi* was much the commoner of the two.

Mr Armstrong has illustrated his monograph with facsimiles of specimen folios of the MSS. of the unpublished anonymous version and of the fragments of Gui's work and of the prose versions of the *Barlaam and Josaphat*, and these enhance the interest of a work which is a valuable contribution to the study of this interesting Old French saint's story.

M. K. Pope.

Oxford.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Francisci Petrarcae Epistulae Selectae, edidit A. F. JOHNSON. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1923. 8vo. x + 276 pp. 8*s.* 6*d.*

This charming edition of the most important of Petrarch's Letters should be of great value to students of Italian history and literature, who have the requisite knowledge of Latin. And they will be attractive also to all those who are interested in Medieval and Renaissance Latin. For Latin, however debased, was still a living tongue. And in the hands of Petrarch this language, in which the Pope still speaks 'urbi et orbi,' is far from being debased and is intensely alive. Petrarch was the greatest Latinist of his day. The language, it is true, is touched with medieval idiom and constructions, but it is still what a French writer has called 'la langue universelle, la superbe langue, lapidaire et sonore, auprès de laquelle il n'y a que des dialectes,' and the sheer beauty of its form makes us forgive a certain rhetorical verbosity from which no post-classical Latin was ever wholly exempt. And the subject-matter is worthy of the language in which it is clothed. Petrarch wore his great learning lightly and reveals himself as very human and very lovable. The reader who is interested in the political history of Petrarch's era will find the letters full of information, while those to whom fourteenth-century Italian politics are a mystery and a weariness will not be sent empty away. For the letters are full of picturesque incident and exquisite description, and cast a thousand side-lights on the life of their time. There is, for example, the charming letter describing how Petrarch visited Cologne and found crowds by the river side washing their hands (*Fam.* 1. 4). Not knowing German, he sought to be enlightened by quoting the well-known line of Virgil, 'quid vult concursus ad amnem? quidve petunt animae?' And immediately he received the explanation in the same tongue from a kindly German who stood by his side. There is the delightful mock-heroic ascent of Mont Ventoux (*Fam.* 4. 1), there are the exquisite references to the poet's beloved Vaucluse (*Fam.* 8. 3 and elsewhere). For classical scholars there is the famous passage in which Petrarch speaks of himself as the possessor of Cicero's *de Gloria*, now lost to the world (*Sen.* 16. 1), while for lovers of Petrarch's poetry there is the remarkable letter in which he affirms that Laura is no figment (*Fam.* 2. 9), although we should hardly care to affirm her reality on the evidence of this letter alone. It is a wonderful collection. Petrarch has not the vigour or shrewd wit of Erasmus, still less his conciseness, but he is still one of the company of great letter-writers. The Clarendon Press has given this very ample selection a charming dress, and the editor has provided an admirable commentary, as terse as it is helpful.

H. E. BUTLER.

LONDON.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Bestrafte Untreue, eine allegorische mittelhochdeutsche Minnerede. Mit Einleitung und Anmerkungen herausgegeben von JOHN WILKS. London: University of London Press. 1923. 39 pp. 2*s.* 6*d.*

Studies in the Use of Exempla, with special reference to Middle High German Literature. By MARGARET D. HOWIE. London: University of London Press. 1923. 130 pp. 5*s.*

The above treatises, both approved for research degrees in the University of London, are testimony to the high quality of the work accomplished by the German school of University College. *Bestrafte Untreue*, which was printed from the Heidelberg MS. shortly before the war by Matthaei in no. 24 of the *Deutsche Texte des Mittelalters*, belongs to the large group of allegorical love-poems of which the *Roman de la Rose* is the most famous example, a *genre* to which in his day our own Chaucer paid homage. As a monument of literature the present poem cannot rank very high and its main interest, apart from the further evidence it affords of the absorption of the later Middle Ages with allegorical problems[1], is frankly philological. This portion of his task Mr Wilks, a pupil of Professor Priebsch's, has done with exceptional care. He has subjected the MSS., their philology, their inter-relationship, and the metrics of the poem to careful scrutiny and shows it to be the work of an East Swabian. But in the wealth of critical details contained in the introduction there are one or two strange omissions: nowhere is an attempt made to fix an approximate date for the poem and W, the Weimar MS., is treated with but scant attention. The editor may have lacked an opportunity of consulting the MS. in person, but presumably he might have obtained photographic facsimiles (as he did somewhat superfluously for MS. G) and thus have included an account of its dialectical characteristics. Why, finally, did he write the thesis in German? As an academic exercise the practice no doubt has its value, but it does not help to widen the appeal of a subject which is already restricted to a narrow circle of medievalists.

Miss Howie's treatise is a work of a more ambitious type. In many ways it represents pioneer work for it is only of late years that the importance of the 'exemplum' as a source for medieval literature and art has been recognized. These short pious stories, the successors of the Biblical parable, provided the medieval preacher with the illustrations for his texts, and were disseminated in numerous collections, both in Latin and the vernacular. They were spread most actively by the monks of the Cistercian order and were most popular, as far as Germany is concerned, in Alsace and Switzerland. Miss Howie has studied the use of such 'exempla' in Middle High German literature with special reference to the stories in which the Virgin Mary occupies the chief rôle. She shows conclusively the dependence of most medieval Mary legends on such sources and as an example of their world-wide dissemination pursues the history of the legend of 'The Virgin as Knight' through

[1] Cp. J. Huizinga, *The Waning of the Middle Ages*, London, 1924, pp. 136 ff.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

24 different versions, in Latin and in most of the vernacular tongues of Europe. Of even greater interest to the general reader is her treatment of the 'exempla' which inspired two of the most famous poems of the German Middle Ages: *Der werlt lôn* of Konrad von Würzburg and Hartmann von Aue's *Armer Heinrich*. In an appendix Miss Howie reprints from Klapper two versions of the Latin 'exemplum' from which Hartmann took the main features of his story. If only for the treatment accorded to these two subjects, Miss Howie's treatise deserves a place in the library of every German specialist. But so interesting a study merited a better typographical setting: from motives of economy, no doubt, Miss Howie had her book printed in Germany. Not only is the text disfigured by printer's errors, but her citations also are not always beyond reproach.

L. A. Willoughby.

Sheffield.

Von Deutscher Art und Kunst. Edited by Edna Purdie. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1924. 8vo. 196 pp. 5*s*.

This English edition of the little collection of essays containing 'the expression of pent-up forces, which in the space of three or four years were to change the character of German literature, and to make of it the most revolutionary in eighteenth-century European letters,' satisfies a long-felt need and will be greatly appreciated by students of German. The text has been revised with great care and has the advantage over Lambel's reprint in *Deutsche Literaturdenkmale* that the *Nachschrift* to the essay on *Ossian und die Lieder alter Völker* has now been shifted from its false position after the essay on Shakespeare, in correction of a long perpetuated error of the first edition.

The introduction is written with stimulating enthusiasm and has brought out the full attractiveness of the subject. This attractiveness Miss Purdie shows to be not in the intrinsic worth of the essays, but in their historical position. She has given within comparatively small compass the material necessary for the appreciation of the essays, collectively and severally, and traces the evolution of the leading ideas in each case against the background of contemporary western European criticism. Miss Purdie has wisely refrained from hampering her exposition with too much matter; it may, however, be regretted, that in her survey of the growing appreciation of Shakespeare in Germany she omits any mention of J. E. Schlegel's *Vergleichung Shakespears und Andreas Gryphs* of 1741, which, almost ludicrously tentative in itself, illustrates the strength of the opposing forces, in that it shows a relatively open mind hide-bound by the preconceptions of the regular drama.

The notes are very carefully compiled. They supply all that is necessary for the understanding of the text; a number of minor errors made by Suphan and Redlich in *Herders Werke* are corrected, and

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

their annotations brought up to date. Here and there a little more elucidation of linguistic points might have been given, as with technical terms in the fourth and fifth essays, with expressions such as *Costume der Zeiten*, p. 157, l. 7, and words now obsolete, such as *einfältigen = vereinfachen*, p. 92, l. 14, *Leut*, p. 148, l. 11, or the expression *unter die Vogelstange stellen*, p. 155, l. 18.

It would however be ungrateful to suggest a lack where so much has been given, and this compact little volume should win many readers in this country and stimulate the interest in a phase of German literature so intimately connected with our own.

W. E. Delp.

London.

MINOR NOTICES.

Dr Hyder E. Rollins of New York University continues to add to our knowledge of ballad-literature. We have now to thank him for his edition of *A Handful of Pleasant Delights* (1584) *by Clement Robinson and Divers Others* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; London: H. Milford. 1924. xx + 145 pp. 15*s*.). Dr Rollins shows that the work is a collection of broadside ballads and almost certainly a rehash with additions of *Pleasant Sonnets* licensed to the same printer Richard Jones in 1566. Where there are resemblances between poems in the *Handful* and others in the *Gorgeous Gallery of Gallant Inventions*, 1578, it is the *Gorgeous Gallery* which has plagiarized, not the *Handful* as Mr Charles Crawford thought. Considering that previous editions of the *Handful* are both inaccurate and at present practically unobtainable, Dr Rollins' scholarly edition is most welcome.

G. C. M. S.

There is much curious reading in Mr Ernest W. Dormer's *Gray of Reading: A Sixteenth-century Controversialist and Ballad Writer* (Reading. 1923. 4°, 158 pp. 15*s*. 6*d*. post free from the Author, 32, Melrose Avenue, Reading). William Gray is identified with an individual who in 1535 laid an information against the Abbot of Abbotsbury, near Weymouth. Puttenham credits him with the authorship of the political ballad 'The hunte is up' sung at the time of the Pilgrimage of Grace. In 1538 he was in some capacity assisting Coverdale who was then translating the Bible at Paris, and from this time was employed by Thomas Cromwell. He now published a ballad 'The Fantassie of Idolatrie' in which Popish practices were ridiculed. After Cromwell's fall Gray is accused of having attacked him in a ballad, but Mr Dormer argues for the more likely view that he wrote the counter-ballad defending him. The 'flyting' which ensued led to the committal to the Fleet of Gray and the other writers. In seven weeks he was

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

released, taken into the King's service, and received in quick succession various grants from the Crown, including a large part of the possessions of the dissolved monastery of Reading. In 1547 in the first parliament of Edward VI he represented Reading, probably as a nominee of Somerset with whom on 14th Oct. 1549 he was committed to the Tower. He was shortly released but obliged to acknowledge a debt of £3000 to the King. He left the Tower a ruined man, but Somerset's release again changed his fortunes and in May, 1551, he was discharged of his recognisance. He had however died on 1st Feb. 1551 after commemorating his attachment to Somerset by two poems. These Mr Dormer has printed, both in the version given in Sloane MS. 1206, and in that given in Camb. Univ. Lib. MS. Dd. 9. 31. He had written his own epitaph in which he attributed his death to his wife's tongue. His wife by a previous marriage was grandmother of Blagrave, author of *The Mathematical Jewell.*

Mr Dormer has clearly done much in his Introduction to elucidate the life-story of a very typical sixteenth-century character. He has published the various sets of verses which helped to make Gray's fame; and he has added a number of careful notes. The book is sumptuously printed and is of substantial value as a contribution to the political and literary history of the age of the Reformation. On p. 128 'swettar' is probably a scribal error for 'swett.' Mr Dormer's 'timeous with' = 'contemporary with' is a new expression to me.

G. C. M. S.

In his *Literary Bypaths of the Renaissance* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press; London: H. Milford. 1924. viii + 189 pp. 14*s.*) Professor E. N. S. Thompson of the State University of Iowa gives a broad and pleasantly-written survey of various literary *genres*—Character Books, Emblem Books, War Journalism of the Seventeenth Century (i.e. of the war between Charles I and the Parliament), Familiar Letters, and Books of Courtesy. He ends with a short and sympathetic paper on Thomas Fuller. While a little sketchy, the book will be read with pleasure and instruction—particularly perhaps the paper on Emblem Books.

The suggestion on p. 1 that Wordsworth's *Happy Warrior* was written as a memorial to Beaupuy is contrary to Wordsworth's own account in which Lord Nelson and Captain John Wordsworth are shown to have been the characters he had chiefly in his mind—(the form of the poem was clearly suggested by George Herbert's *Constancy*:—'Who is the honest man? etc.'). While *The Happy Warrior* was written in 1806, Wordsworth believed (erroneously) that Beaupuy had met his death long before in the War of La Vendée.

Two expressions used by Professor Thompson are interesting to an English reader: 'to *leaf through* the volume' (pp. 52 and 60) and 'dates and events do not exactly *jibe*' (p. 115).

G. C. M. S.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Dr Edward D. Snyder's study of *The Celtic Revival in English Literature, 1760–1800* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press; London: H. Milford. 1923. 208 pp. 12*s.* 6*d.*) is a sound investigation of an interesting aspect of the Romantic movement. Dr Snyder's work is scholarly and painstaking and we are so grateful for what he has given that we may be pardoned if we ask for more. The book is limited to the growth of interest in Druidism and Celtic antiquities generally. To us it seems, however, that some account of books of travel in Wales, Scotland and Ireland would also have been worth while. Enthusiasm for wild mountain scenery and interest in Celtic traditions often went hand in hand. Of this the author says nothing. Dr Snyder admits that the dates which he has chosen as his limits are arbitrary and tries to atone for this by a brief account in his introduction of the signs of interest in Celtic matters prior to 1760. This seems to us the least satisfactory part of the book and it is evident that Dr Snyder's acquaintance with this period is less thorough than with the years 1760–1800. We must protest also against the idea that the great fountain-head of the Celtic revival is Lewis Morris. What of the famous antiquary Edward Lhuyd, the Keeper of the Ashmolean Museum? His biography in the *D. N. B.* and the article by Richard Ellis in the *Transactions of the Honourable Society of Cymmrodorion for* 1906–1907, pp. 1–51, show conclusively that Dr Snyder has done him an injustice.

Another point on which we find Dr Snyder open to criticism is his treatment of Druidism. He seems to be quite unaware of the recent research in Wales which has demonstrated that Edward Williams (Iolo Morganwg), who is referred to on p. 186 as an 'excellent authority,' was a forger in the style of Chatterton and Macpherson. To his fabrications we owe the spurious Druidism which figured so largely in the Celtic revival.

One or two other remarks. The *Cambrian Register* (1796–1799) is not mentioned; and in the list of works on Ossian's popularity abroad (p. 78 note) there is no reference to his influence in Scandinavia and Finland, even as late as Runeberg. Further, it seems surprising that Dr Snyder should attach so little importance to Collins's *Ode on the Popular Superstitions of the Highlands*, and in the footnote on p. 147 one would have expected a reference to Bronson's account of its history in his edition of Collins. Lastly, does Dr Snyder really think that 'Except for the *Lyrical Ballads* and the work of Burns, the period from 1760 to 1800 is peculiarly destitute of poems that are in themselves masterpieces'?

H. G. W.

Digitized by Google

Original from
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Dr Koszul, the editor of *Proserpine and Midas, Two unpublished Mythological Dramas by Mary Shelley* (London: H. Milford. 1923. 3*s.* 6*d.*), came across the original texts as long ago as 1905, but hesitated to publish them for fear of overrating their intrinsic value, until the Shelley centenary year gave him an opportunity of making this addition to the literature of the romantic revival. No excuse is needed, however, for the publication of the poems which provided the setting for four of Shelley's lyrics, *Arethusa*, the *Hymn to Ceres*, and the hymns of Apollo and Pan, here seen in their proper context. It is true that the setting itself reaches no very high level of poetry. Mrs Shelley's blank verse is at its best merely graceful, but it is of that safe and undistinguished kind which never rises high enough to provoke the catastrophe of bathos. In contact with her husband's lyrics, its fate is less happy: the contrast is apparent when, at the close of the poem Proserpine favours her attendant nymph Ino with the compliment, quite unimpeachable on the ground of truth:

> Thanks, Ino dear, you have beguiled an hour
> With poesy that might make pause to list
> The nightingale in her sweet evening song.

Proserpine is not without passages of some charm, and shows a feeling for nature which is appropriate to the classical origin of the subject. In *Midas* the attempt at grandiose soliloquy owes something to Tamburlaine and Sir Epicure Mammon; but Mrs Shelley's imagination seems to have exhausted itself in *Frankenstein*. At this date (1820), it was capable neither of combining sublimity with extravagance, nor of giving colour and variety to her hero's golden dreams, and the result is monotonous. Nevertheless, the two plays, dialogues in verse rather than dramas, add something to our knowledge of the personality of the authoress. The editor, in a careful and excellently written introduction, points out the circumstances in Mrs Shelley's life which 'proved more powerful on her than the inspiration of literature,' and, while insisting upon the unpretentious character of the plays as compared with her prose compositions, regards them as the offspring of 'a more purely artistic mood' than that of *Frankenstein*, 'instinct with the serene joy and clear warmth of Italian skies, combining a good deal of youthful buoyancy with a sort of quiet and unpretending philosophy,' and representing a felicitous interval between the passion of her earlier and the reserve of her later work. The introduction also contains some valuable considerations of the attitude of the English romantic poets to classical mythology, and the hitherto unpublished fragment from Mrs Shelley's journal, of a draft of an essay on the theme, 'The necessity of a Belief in the Heathen Mythology to a Christian,' is not of interest merely as involving an entertaining paradox, but also as marking a distinct modification of the negative and destructive criticism which, at an earlier date, Shelley had applied to pagan in common with Christian tradition.

A. H. T.

Digitized by Google Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

In *Gli Spiriti della vigilia* (Florence: Vallecchi. 1924. 221 pp. 8 lire), Dr Camillo Pellizzi interprets the significance of three young writers, all more or less in rebellion against the problems and conditions with which they were confronted, whom he regards as having been precursors of a new epoch in Italian life and letters. Carlo Michelstaedter, a poet writing on philosophy in a fashion that rather suggests the heroes of D'Annunzio's romances, killed himself in 1910; Giovanni Boine, a mystic under French and Spanish influences, was for a time associated with the modernists of the *Rinnovamento*, and died of consumption in 1917; Renato Serra, 'classico aspirante al romanticismo,' mainly a literary critic, fell in the war. To English readers the third at least is more than a mere name, in virtue of his *Esame di coscienza di un Letterato* which Dr Piero Rébora has edited for the Clarendon Press. Dr Pellizzi's brilliant if somewhat paradoxical book is singularly interesting as illustrating something of the mentality of the younger men to-day who are associated with what their Leader has so finely called 'questo ritmo accelerato della vita italiana.'

E. G. G.

The particular value of the attractive volume on *Il Mito di Faust dal personaggio storico al poema di Goethe*, by Vincenzo Errante (Bologna: N. Zanichelli. xi + 327 pp. L. 25.50), appears to me to lie in the author's presentation of the subject against a more spacious spiritual background than is to be found in other books on the Faust saga, and in his attempt to establish, by emphasising certain basic ideas, a less broken development for the saga than the actual facts might seem to warrant. This is seen in the plan of Signor Errante's volume. He divides it into two main 'cycles,' 'Il Dannato' and 'Il Redento,' separated by a section entitled 'Il personaggio decaduto,' when the spiritual development of the myth is at a standstill. The first cycle carries us from the 'turpissimus nebulo inquinatissimae vitae' of Melanchthon to Faust as seen through the Lutheran spectacles of the Spiess *Faustbuch*, and 'the new philosopher of the Renaissance,' represented in Marlowe's *Tragicall History*; the second cycle discusses the Faust of the age of Rationalism (Lessing's fragment) and of the 'Sturm und Drang' (Maler Müller's *Faust* and Goethe's *Urfaust*); while the intervening section deals with the 'Volksschauspiele,' and 'Puppenspiele.' With the *Urfaust* Signor Errante closes his present volume, but he promises a successor devoted to Goethe's completed poem and to subsequent Fausts. It is to be hoped that this will not be long delayed; for he leads us here to what for most of us is only the threshold and leaves us—begins the study of Goethe's *Faust*, tantalisingly to break it off at the initial stage. The author has felt this inconclusiveness, and has endeavoured to mitigate it by rounding off his volume with a rapid glance through Goethe's drama as a whole. We look forward to the more detailed treatment he promises.

J. G. R.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

June–August, 1924.

GENERAL.

AGATE, J., The Contemporary Theatre, 1923. London, Parsons. 7*s.* 6*d.*

ALDINGTON, R., Literary Studies and Reviews. London, Allen and Unwin. 7*s.* 6*d.*

CAZAMIAN, L., La psychanalyse et la critique littéraire (*Rev. litt. comp.*, IV, 3, Sept.).

Characters, A Book of. Compiled by R. Aldington. (Broadway Translations.) London, G. Routledge. 12*s.* 6*d.*

COUCH, Sir ARTHUR QUILLER, Adventures in Criticism ; On the Art of Reading. New editions. Cambridge, Univ. Press. Each 5*s.*

CROLL, M. W., Muret and the History of Attic Prose (*Publ. M. L. A. Amer.*, XXXIX, 2, June).

Essays by Divers Hands. Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature. New Series, Vol. IV. Ed. by E. Gosse. London, H. Milford. 7*s.*

Festschrift Eugen Mogk zum 70. Geburtstag. Halle, M. Niemeyer. 28 M.

JESPERSEN, O., The Philosophy of Grammar. London, Allen and Unwin. 12*s.* 6*d.*

LOVEJOY, A. O., On the Discrimination of Romanticism (*Publ. M. L. A. Amer.*, XXXIX, 2, June).

POUND, L., The Term 'Communal' (*Publ. M. L. A. Amer.*, XXXIX, 2, June).

Short-Title Catalogue of Books printed in France and of French Books printed in other Countries from 1470 to 1600, now in the British Museum. London, British Museum.

St Alban, Illustrations to the Life of, in Trin. Coll. Dublin, MS. E. i. 40. Reproduced in Collotype Facsimile. By W. R. L. Lowe and E. F. Jacob. Oxford, Clar. Press. 42*s.*

VOIGT, M., Beiträge zur Geschichte der Visionenliteratur im Mittelalter (Palaestra, CXLVI). Leipzig, Mayer und Müller. 10 M.

WITKOWSKI, G., Textkritik und Editionstechnik neuerer Schriftwerke. Leipzig, Haessel. 5 M.

ROMANCE LANGUAGES.

CHAGAS, F., et P. MÉLEAR, Virgile, Dante, Camoëns et l'expansion du génie latine. Paris, É. Champion. 5 fr.

KOLOVRAT, G. DE, Étude sur la vocalisation de la consonne *l* dans les langues romanes. Paris, É. Champion. 20 fr.

Italian.

AUSTIN, H. D., Dante Notes. IV. (*Mod. Lang. Notes*, XXXIX, 6, June.)

BEZZOLA, R. R., Abbozzo di una storia dei gallicismi italiani nei primi secoli (750–1300). Zürich, Verlag Seldwyla. 20 fr.

BOCCACCIO, G., Il Filostrato. Transl. by H. Cummings. Princeton, Univ. Press ; London, H. Milford. 9*s.*

BOCCHIALINI, J., Luigi Sanvitale poeta. Parma, Aurea Parma. L. 10.

BUCHMANN, J., Il dialetto di Blenio. Saggio fonetico-morfologico. Paris, É. Champion. 15 fr.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

CALOSSO, U., L'anarchia di V. Alfieri. Bari, Laterza. L. 12.

CORRADO, L., Luci di cieli e luci dell' anima. Riflessi danteschi. Milan, Albrighi e Segati. L. 10.

D'AMATO, A., Studi sul Tasso e sul Manzoni. Piacenza, Porta. L. 10.

GANDIGLIO, A., G. Pascoli poeta latino. Naples, Perrella.

GENTILE, G., Bertrando Spaventa. Florence, Vallecchi. L. 10.

GRAF, A., Foscolo, Manzoni, Leopardi. Saggi. Turin, Chiantore. L. 30.

GRANDGENT, C. H., Discourses on Dante. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard Univ. Press ; London, H. Milford. 10*s.* 6*d.*

MACHIAVELLI, N., Il Principe e altri scritti minori. A cura di M. Scherillo. Milan, Hoepli. L. 15.

MAUGAIN, G., Les prétendues relations du Tasse et du Ronsard (*Rev. litt. comp.*, iv, 3, Sept.).

PANCRAZI, P., I Toscani dell' Ottocento. Florence, Bemporad. L. 15.

PELLICO, S., Le mie Prigioni and Francesca da Rimini. Ed. by K. McKenzie. Chicago, Univ. of Chicago Press. $1.40.

PICCOLI, V., Leopardi. Milan, Alpes. L. 6.

PREINDL, H., Jacopone da Todi. Leipzig, Vier Quellen. 2 M. 60.

RIZZI, F., Michelangelo poeta. Milan, Treves. L. 15.

STARKIE, W., The Commedia dell' arte and the Roman Comedy (*Proceed. Royal Irish Acad.*, xxxvi, 78).

VACCALUZZO, N., Saggi e documenti di letteratura e storia. Catania, Galàtola. L. 15.

Spanish.

ARTIGAS, M., Don Pedro Mudarra de Avellaneda (*Bol. Acad. españ.*, xi, 53).

FARINELLI, A., I Tedeschi nel giudizio degli Spagnuoli sino all' alba del romanticismo (*Archivum rom.*, viii).

FECHTER, W. L., Notes on the Chronology of Lope de Vega's Comedias (*Mod. Lang. Notes*, xxxix, 5, May).

Fuero de Guadalajara (1219). Ed. by H. Keniston. (Elliott Monographs, xvi.) Princeton, Univ. Press ; London, H. Milford. 4*s.* 6*d.*

GILI GAYA, S., Influencia del acento y de las consonantes en curvas de intonación (*Rev. fil. españ.*, xi, 2).

MENÉNDEZ PIDAL, R., El rey Rodrigo en la literatura (*cont.*) (*Bol. Acad. españ.*, xi, 53).

MEYER-LÜBKE, W., La sonorización de las sordas intervocálicas latinas en español (*Rev. fil. españ.*, xi, 1).

RODRÍGUEZ MARÍN, F., Nuevos datos para las biografías de cien escritores de los siglos XVI y XVII. Madrid, Rev. de Archivos. 10 pes.

SÁNCHEZ ALONSO, B., Los satíricos latinos y la sátira de Quevedo (*Rev. fil. españ.*, xi, 1, 2).

TARR, F. C., Prepositional Complementary Clauses in Spanish, with special reference to the Works of Pérez Galdós. Princeton Dissertation.

French.

(*a*) *General* (*incl. Linguistic*).

ABRY, E., C. AUDIC et P. CROUZET, Histoire illustré de la littérature française. 6e éd. London, G. G. Harrap. 6*s.* 6*d.*

CLÉDAT, L., En marge des grammaires. IV. Le vocabulaire (*Rev. phil. franç.*, XXXVI, 2).

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

GRAMMONT, M., L'assimilation : notes de phonétique générale. Paris, É. Champion.

TERRACHER, A., Géographie linguistique. Histoire et philologie. Paris, É. Champion. 8 fr.

ZELIQZON, L., Dictionnaire des patois romans de la Moselle. III (N–Z). Strasbourg, Librairie Istra ; London, H. Milford. 5*s*.

(*b*) *Old French* (*Anglo-Norman*).

BEAUNIER, A., Les romans de la Table Ronde (*Rev. d. d. Mondes*, July 1).

HUE DE ROSELANDE, Protheselaus. Ein altfranzösischer Abenteuerroman. (Gesellschaft für roman. Litt., xlv.) Herausg. von F. Kluckow. I. Halle, M. Niemeyer. 15 M.

LOOMIS, R. S., Bleheris and the Tristram Story (*Mod. Lang. Notes*, xxxix, 6, June).

STUDER, P., and J. EVANS, Anglo-Norman Lapidaries. Paris, É. Champion. 60 fr.

(*c*) *Modern French.*

ALMERAS, H. D', Mad. de Sévigné en Provence (*Rev. mondiale*, June 1).

ARVIN, N. C., Eugene Scribe and the French Theatre, 1815–60. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard Univ. Press ; London, H. Milford. 12*s*. 6*d*.

BEAUNIER, A., Critiques et romanciers. Paris, Crès. 7 fr. 50.

BECKER, P. A., Bonaventure des Periers als Dichter und Erzähler ; Mellin de Saint-Gelais. (Akad. der Wissenschaften in Wien, Phil.-hist. Klasse, 200, 3, 4.) Vienna, Hölder. 2 M. 60 and 2 M. 70.

BECKER, P. A., Christophle de Longueil, sein Leben und sein Briefwechsel. Bonn, K. Schroeder. 10 M.

BELLESSORT, A., Balzac et son œuvre. Paris, Perrin. 12 fr.

BOSSUET, J. B., Correspondance, publ. par Ch. Urbain et E. Levesque. XIV. Paris, Hachette. 30 fr.

BROOKS, N. C., Notes on Performances of French Mystery Plays (*Mod. Lang. Notes*, xxxix, 5, May).

CARCASSONE, E., La Chine dans l'Esprit des Lois (*Rev. d'hist. litt.*, xxxi, 2 June).

CARRÉ, J. M., La correspondance inédite de Sainte-Beuve et de Michelet (*Rev. d'hist. litt.*, xxxi, 2, June).

CHABRILLAN, Comtesse, Une amie de Voltaire : Mad. de Saint-Julien. Paris, É. Champion. 12 fr.

CHAPPELL, A. F., The Enigma of Rabelais. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 7*s*. 6*d*.

CHINARD, G., Les amitiés américaines de Mad. de Houdetot (Bibl. de la Rev. de Litt. comp., viii). Paris, É. Champion. 6 fr.

CLOUZOT, E., et H. MARTIN, Tables générales de la Revue des études rabelaisiennes, Tome I–X. Paris, É. Champion. 30 fr.

COMMYNES, PH. DE, Mémoires, éd. par J. Calmette. I (1464–74). (Classiques de l'Histoire de France au moyen âge, iii.) Paris, É. Champion. 15 fr.

DESBORDES-VALMORE, M., Lettres à Prosper Valmore. 2 vols. Paris, Éd. de la Sirène. 50 fr.

ESTÈVE, E., Sully Prudhomme (*Rev. des cours et conf.*, May 1, 15, June 30).

FRANÇOIS, A., J. J. Rousseau et la science genévoise au XVIII^{e} siècle (*Rev. d'hist. litt.* xxxi, 2, June).

GABORY, G., A. Gide, son œuvre. Paris, Le Carnet critique. 4 fr.

GILLOT, H., E. Delacroix, d'après son journal (*Rev. des cours et conf.*, May 1, 15).

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

GIRAUD, V., Les écrivains suisses et la France (*Rev. d. d. Mondes*, May 15).

HANOTAUX, G., Ronsard et Musset (*Rev. d. d. Mondes*, June 1).

HATZFELD, H., Die französische Renaissancelyrik (Epochen der französischen Literatur, ii). Munich, M. Hueber. 3 M. 80.

HENRIOT, E., Stendhaliana. Essais et critique. Paris, Crès. 7 fr. 50.

HUBERT, R., L'évolution intellectuelle d'E. Renan (*Rev. des cours et conf.*, May 15).

JUSSERAND, P., Prosper Mérimée. Esquisse d'une édition critique de sa correspondance. II. (*Rev. d'hist. litt.*, xxxi, 2 June.)

LANGE, M., Le Comte Arthur de Gobineau. Étude biographique et critique. (Publ. de la Faculté des Lettres de Strasbourg, xxii.) Strasbourg, Istra; London, H. Milford. 8*s.* 6*d.*

LAUMONIER, P., Ronsard et l'Écosse (*Rev. litt. comp.*, iv, 3, Sept.).

LE BRETON, A., Les Misérables de V. Hugo (*Rev. des cours et conf.*, May 1, 15, June 30).

MOORE, O. H., The Sources of V. Hugo's 'Quatrevingt-Treize' (*Publ. M. L. A. Amer.*, xxxix, 2, June).

MOREAU, P., Chateaubriand et l'Amérique (*Rev. des cours et conf.*, June 30).

MORNET, D., Histoire de la littérature et de la pensée française. Paris, Larousse. 7 fr. 50.

NOBLET, A., La poésie lyrique en France, des origines à 1914, avec un essai de bibliographie. London, Dent. 7*s.* 6*d.*

PALÉOLOGUE, M., Romantisme et diplomatie : Talleyrand, Metternich, Chateaubriand. Paris, Hachette. 8 fr. 50.

PARTRIDGE, E., The French Romantics' Knowledge of English Literature, 1820–48. (Bibl. de la Rev. de litt. comp., xi.) Paris, É. Champion. 40 fr.

PASCAL, B., Œuvres complètes, ed. par F. Strowski. I. Paris, Ollendorff.

PATRICK, G. Z., Étude morphologique et syntaxique des verbes dans Maistre Pierre Pathelin (Univ. of California Publ. in Modern Phil., viii, 4). Berkeley, Cal., Univ. of California Press.

PICARD, G., Balzac et Stendhal (*Rev. mondiale*, July 1).

RADOUANT, R., L'union de l'éloquence et de la philosophie au temps de Ramus (*Rev. d'hist. litt.*, xxxi, 2, June).

RICKWOOD, E., Rimbaud : The Boy and the Poet. London, Heinemann. 12*s.* 6*d.*

ROUSSEAU, J. J., Correspondance générale. Éd. par Th. Dufour. I. Paris, Colin. 25 fr.

SCHÄFER, B., Der Provinziale in der französischen Komödie des 19. Jahrh. (Giessener Beitr. zur roman. Phil., xiv). Giessen, Roman. Seminar. 3 M. 75.

SERBAN, N., P. Loti : sa vie, son œuvre. Paris, Presses universitaires. 10 fr.

THÉRIVE, A., J. K. Huysmans, son œuvre. Paris, Art catholique. 4 fr. 50.

THIEM, H. P., Un manuscrit inédit de Fabre d'Olivet (*Rev. d'hist. litt.*, xxxi, 2, June).

VOLTAIRE, F. A. DE, Philosophical Dictionary. Selected and translated by H. I. Woolf. London, Allen and Unwin. 10*s.* 6*d.*

WHITBRIDGE, A., Critical Ventures in Modern French Literature. London, Scribners. 8*s.* 6*d.*

GERMANIC LANGUAGES.

Scandinavian.

BEYER, H., Søren Kierkegaard og Norge. Kristiania, Aschehoug. 12 kr.

CARLSSON, A. M., E. A. Karlfeldt. Personlighet och diktning. En studie. Stockholm, Wahlström och Widstrand. 3 kr.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

ERDMANN, N., A. Strindberg. Übertragen von H. Goebel. Leipzig, Haessel. 15 M.

FLOM, G. T., The Language of the Konungs Skuggsia (Speculum regale). II. (Univ. of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, viii, 4.) Urbana, Univ. of Illinois. $1.50.

FLOM, G. T., The Study of Place Names with special reference to Norway (*Journ. Engl. Germ. Phil.*, xxiii, 2).

JESSEN, F. DE, Bibliographie de la littérature française relative au Danemark. Paris, Meynial. 30 fr.

KARLFELDT, E. A., C. F. Dahlgren. En bild ur svensk romantik. Stockholm, Wahlström och Widstrand. 4 kr. 75.

LINDBLAD, G., A. Strindberg som berättare. Studier i hans tidigare prosa. Stockholm, P. A. Norstedt. 4 kr. 75.

MÖRNER, B., Den Strindberg jag känt. Stockholm, A. Bonnier. 8 kr. 50.

OLRIK, A., Breve til H. Begtrup. Copenhagen, Gyldendal. 4 kr. 75.

SCHÜCK, H., Den svenska förlagsbokhandelns historia. I. Stockholm, P. A. Norstedt. 30 M.

Snorra Sturlusonar Edda. Codex Wormianus. A M. 242, Fol. Udg. af Kommissionen for det Arnamagnæanske Legat. Copenhagen, Gyldendal. 3 kr.

SÖDERHJELM, W., K. A. Tavastjerna. En levnadsteckning. 2 delar. Stockholm, A. Bonnier. 9 kr. 50.

STENBERG, T. T., Ibsen's Catilina and Goethe's Iphigenie auf Tauris (*Mod. Lang. Notes*, xxxix, 6, June).

VRIES, J. DE, H. Ibsen. Maastricht, Boosten en Stols. 6 fl.

Dutch.

Esmoreit. Mary of Nimmegen. Transl. by H. M. Ayres. (Dutch Library, ii, iii.) The Hague, Nijhoff. Each 3*s.* 6*d.*

GROOTAERS, L., Quelques emprunts entre patois flamands et wallons (*Leuwensche Bijdr.*, xvi, 1, 2).

HUIZINGA, J., Erasmus. Haarlem, H. D. Tjeenk Willink. 5 fl. 25.

ZEY, J. J., J. van Vondel Altaargeheimenissen in dertien lezingen uitgelegd. 's-Hertogenburg, Teulings. 10 fl.

English.

(*a*) *General* (*incl. Linguistic*).

BOAS, G., Short Guide to the Reading of English Literature. London, G. G. Harrap. 1*s.*

FOWLER, F. G. and H. W., The Pocket Oxford Dictionary. Oxford, Clar. Press, 3*s.* 6*d.*

KENYON, J. S., American Pronunciation. A Text-Book of Phonetics for Students of English. Ann Arbor, Mich., G. Wahr. $1.50.

MAWER, A., and F. M. STENTON, Introduction to the Survey of Place-Names. I. (English Place-Names Society, I, i.) Cambridge, Univ. Press.

MAWER, A., The Chief Elements used in English Place-Names. (English Place-Names Society, I, ii.) Cambridge, Univ. Press.

} 21*s.* net. 2 vols.

Oxford English Dictionary, The. x. Ti–Z. Unforeseeing–Unright. By W. A. Craigie. Oxford, Clar. Press. 10*s.*

SMITH, L. P., Four Words: Romantic, Originality, Creation, Genius. (S. P. E. Tracts, xvii.) Oxford, Clar. Press. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

(*b*) ***Old and Middle English.***

COOK, A. S., The Old English Andreas and Bishop Acca of Hexham (from Trans. of Connecticut Acad. of Arts and Sciences, Vol. xxvi). New Haven, Conn., Yale Univ. Press. $1.20.

LYDGATE, J., The Fall of Princes. Ed. by H. Bergen. 3 parts. (Early English Text Society, Extra Series, 121–123.) London, H. Milford. 45*s*.

Mittelenglische Umdichtung von Boccaccios De claris mulieribus, Die. Herausg. von G. Schleich. (Palaestra, cxliv.) Leipzig, Mayer and Müller. 16 M.

WELLS, J. E., Second Supplement to a Manual of the Writings in Middle English, 1050–1400. New Haven, Conn., Yale Univ. Press ; London, H. Milford. 6*s*. 6*d*.

WELLS, W. H., Chaucer as a Literary Critic (*Mod. Lang. Notes*, xxxix, 5, May).

(*c*) ***Modern English.***

BABBITT, J., and others. Criticism in America. Its Function and Status. New York, Harcourt Brace.

BARBEAU, L., Sheridan. Paris, Renaissance du Livre. 5 fr.

BAZALGETTE, L., Henry Thoreau. Paris, Rieder et Cie. 8 fr. 75.

BECKWITH, M. W., The English Ballad in America (*Publ. M. L. A. Amer.*, xxxix, 2, June).

BELLAMY, R. L., Byron the Man. London, Kegan Paul. 5*s*.

BIRRELL, A., More Obiter Dicta. London, Heinemann. 7*s*. 6*d*.

BOYNTON, P. H., Some Contemporary Americans. The Personal Equation in Literature. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard Univ. Press ; London, H. Milford. $2.

BRENNECKE, E., Thomas Hardy's Universe. London, Fisher Unwin. 8*s*. 6*d*.

BRIE, F., Deismus und Atheismus in der englischen Renaissance (*Schluss*) (*Anglia*, xlviii, 2, June).

BRUCE, H., W. Blake and his Companions from 1818 to 1827 (*Publ. M. L. A. Amer.*, xxxix, 2, June).

BUCHAN, J., Some Notes on Sir Walter Scott (English Association). London, H. Milford. 2*s*.

BULLEN, A. H., Elizabethans. London, Chapman and Hall. 10*s*. 6*d*.

BUTTERFIELD, H., The Historical Novel. An Essay. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 5*s*.

CASSIDY, J., A Study of Browning's 'Ring and the Book.' Oxford, B. Blackwell. 7*s*. 6*d*.

CLARE, J., Madrigals and Chronicles. Newly found Poems, ed. by E. Blunden. London, Beaumont Press. 25*s*.

CRAWFORD, A. W., The Apparitions in Macbeth (*Mod. Lang. Notes*, xxxix, 6, June).

DAMON, S. F., W. Blake. His Philosophy and Symbols. London, Constable. 42*s*.

DOTTIN, P., D. de Foe et ses romans. 2 vols. Paris, Presses universitaires. Each 25 fr.

DRAPER, J. W., The Narrative-Technique of the 'Faerie Queene' (*Publ. M. L. A. Amer.*, xxxix, 2, June).

DRINKWATER, J., Patriotism in Literature (Home University Library). London, Williams and Norgate. 2*s*. 6*d*.

DULLEMEN, J. J. VAN, Mrs Gaskell, Novelist and Biographer. Amsterdam, H. J. Paris. 3 fl. 50.

EMERSON, O. F., The Early Literary Life of Sir Walter Scott (*Journ. Engl. Germ. Phil.*, xxiii, 2, April).

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

EMERSON, O. F., Notes of Gilbert Imlay, Early American Writer (*Publ. M. L. A. Amer.*, xxxix, 2, June).

FANSHAWE, Sir R., The Fourth Book of Virgil's Aeneid. Ed. by A. L. Irvine. Oxford, B. Blackwell. 6*s.*

FISCHER, W., Defoe und Milton (*Eng. Stud.*, lviii, 2).

FLASDIECK, H. M., John Brown (1715–66) und seine Dissertation on Poetry and Music (Stud. zur engl. Phil., lviii). Halle, M. Niemeyer. 5 M.

FREEMAN, J., English Portraits and Essays. London, Hodder and Stoughton. 7*s.* 6*d.*

GARROD, H. W., Byron, 1824–1924. A Lecture. Oxford, Clar. Press. 1*s.* 6*d.*

GAY, J., The Shepherd's Week. In six Pastorals. Ed. by H. F. B. Brett-Smith. Oxford, B. Blackwell. 4*s.* 6*d.*

GILDON, C., Robinson Crusoe Examin'd and Criticis'd. Ed. by P. Dottin. London, Dent. 5*s.*

GRAVES, T. S., Recent Literature of the English Renaissance (*Stud. Phil.*, xxi, 2, April).

GREENE, R., The Black Bookes Messenger, 1592; Cuthbert Conny-Catcher, The Defence of Conny-Catching, 1592. London, J. Lane. 3*s.*

HAFERKORN, R., Gotik und Ruine in der englischen Dichtung des 18. Jahrh. (Leipziger Beitr. zur engl. Phil., iv). Leipzig, B. Tauchnitz. 3 M.

HARMAN, E. G., The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia. London, C. Palmer. 12*s.* 6*d.*

JAMES I, Daemonologie (1597); Newes from Scotland (1591). Ed. by G. B. Harrison. London, John Lane. 3*s.*

JOHNSON, S., Journey to the Western Islands of Scotland and Boswell's Journal of a Tour in the Hebrides. Ed. by R. W. Chapman. Oxford, Clar. Press. 12*s.* 6*d.*

KELSHALL, J. M., Robert Bridges, Poet Laureate. London, R. Scott. 2*s.* 6*d.*

KEYNES, G., A Bibliography of Sir Thomas Browne. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 42*s.*

KOCH, J., Echte und unechte Masken (*Engl. Stud.*, lviii, 2).

LANGDON, I., Milton's Theory of Poetry and Fine Art (Cornell Studies in English). New Haven, Yale Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 9*s.*

LAWRENCE, D. H., Studies in Classic American Literature. London, M. Secker. 10*s.* 6*d.*

LINDSEY, E. S., The Music of the Songs in Fletcher's Plays (*Stud. Phil.*, xxi, 2, April).

MACKAIL, J. W., Bentley's Milton (Brit. Acad., Wharton Lecture, xv). London, H. Milford. 1*s.* 6*d.*

MACKAIL, J. W., The Pilgrim's Progress. A Lecture. London, Longmans. 3*s.*

MACKENZIE, A. M., The Women in Shakespeare's Plays. London, Heinemann. 15*s.*

MASEFIELD, J., Shakespeare and Spiritual Life (Romanes Lecture). Oxford, Clar. Press. 2*s.*

MILTON, J., Some newly discovered Stanzas. Reprinted by H. C. H. Candy. London, Nisbet. 7*s.* 6*d.*

MORGAN, A. E., Tendencies of Modern English Drama. London, Constable. 10*s.* 6*d.*

MUDGE, I. G., and M. E. SEARS, A George Eliot Dictionary. London, G. Routledge. 12*s.* 6*d.*

MUTSCHMANN, H., Milton's Eyesight and the Chronology of his Works. Dorpat.

NEFF, E., Carlyle and Mill. Mystic and Utilitarian. New York, Columbia Univ. Press. $2.25.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

NETHERCOT, A. H., The Reputation of the 'Metaphysical Poets' during the Seventeenth Century (*Journ. Engl. Germ. Phil.*, xxiii, 2, April).

NICOLSON, M. E., Realistic Elements in Spenser's Style (*Stud. Phil.*, xxi, 2, April).

PADELFORD, F. M., The Allegory of Chastity in 'The Faerie Queene' (*Stud. Phil.*, xxi, 2, April).

PHELPS, W. L., Howell, James, Bryant and other Essays. London, Macmillan. 9*s.*

RUPRECHT, W. K., Felicia Hemans und die englischen Beziehungen zur deutschen Literatur im ersten Drittel des 19. Jahrh. II. (*Anglia*, xlviii, 2, June.)

SALT, H. S., P. B. Shelley, Poet and Pioneer. New ed. London, Allen and Unwin. 3*s.* 6*d.*

SELLS, A. L., Les sources françaises de Goldsmith. Paris, É. Champion. 15 fr.

SHAKESPEARE, W., The Tragedy of Cymbeline. Ed. by S. B. Hemingway. New Haven, Yale Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 4*s.* 6*d.*

STEPHEN, L., Some Early Impressions. London, Hogarth Press. 7*s.* 6*d.*

STOKES, F. G., A Dictionary of the Characters and Proper Names in the Works of Shakespeare. London, G. G. Harrap. 21*s.*

TAGLIALATELA, E., Shelley. Lanciano, M. Carabba. L. 8.

THOMPSON, E. N. S., Literary Bypaths of the Renaissance. New Haven, Yale Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 14*s.*

TUPPER, C. F., Essays erroneously attributed to Goldsmith (*Publ. M. L. A. Amer.*, xxxix, 2, June).

ULLRICH, H., Defoes Robinson Crusoe. Die Geschichte eines Weltbuches. Leipzig, O. R. Reisland. 3 M.

VAN DAM, B. A. P., The Text of Shakespeare's Hamlet. London, J. Lane. 21*s.*

VELDKAMP, J., Samuel Butler. Hilversum, Rozenbeek. 4 fl. 75.

WELLS, H. W., Poetic Imagery, illustrated from Elizabethan Literature. New York, Columbia Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 8*s.*

WESTERFRÖLKE, H., Englische Kaffeehäuser als Sammelpunkte der literarischen Welt im Zeitalter von Dryden und Addison (Jenaer german. Forschungen, v). Jena, Frommann. 3 M. 80.

WILSON, D. A., Carlyle to the French Revolution. London, Kegan Paul. 15*s.*

WITHERSPOON, A. M., The Influence of Robert Garnier on Elizabethan Drama. New Haven, Yale Univ. Press; London, H. Milford. 8*s.* 6*d.*

WOLFF, L., G. Meredith. Paris, Payot. 12 fr.

YVON, P., Horace Walpole as a Poet. Paris, Presses universitaires. 15 fr.

YVON, P., Horace Walpole: essai de biographie psychologique et littéraire. Paris, Presses universitaires. 75 fr.

German.

(*a*) *General* (*incl. Linguistic*).

Beiträge zur germanischen Sprachwissenschaft. Festschrift für O. Behaghel. Herausg. von W. Horn. Heidelberg, C. Winter. 14 M.

DAMMANN, O., Aus den Papieren der Basseschen Buchhandlung. Ein Beitrag zur Frühgeschichte der deutschen Philologie. (Jenaer german. Forschungen, vii.) Jena, Frommann. 4 M. 50.

(*b*) *Old and Middle High German.*

Judith. Ein mitteldeutsches Gedicht aus dem 13. Jahrh. Herausg. von R. Palgen. (Altdeutsche Textbibl., xviii.) Halle, M. Niemeyer. 2 M. 80.

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

KONRAD VON WÜRZBURG, Kleinere Dichtungen, herausg. von E. Schröder. I. Berlin, Weidmann. 2 M.

PETZET, E., und O. GLAUNING, Deutsche Schrifttafeln des IX. bis XVI. Jahrh. Aus Hss. der Bayrischen Staatsbibliothek. Abt. IV. Leipzig, K. W. Hiersemann. 35 M.

RICHEY, M. F., Gahmuret Anschevin. A Contribution to the Study of Wolfram von Eschenbach. Oxford, Blackwell. 3*s*.

Wayland Dietrich Saga, The. By K. M. Buck. Nine Parts. London, Mayhew. Each 1*s*.

(*c*) *Modern German.*

ALFERO, G., La lirica di T. Storm. Saggio critico. Palermo, Sandron. L. 7.50.

BACH, A., Aus dem Kreise der Sophie La Roche. Cologne, Saaleck. 2 M.

BETZ, G., Lichtenberg as a Critic of the English Stage (*Journ. Engl. Germ. Phil.*, XXIII, 2).

BRACKER, H., Rahmenerzählung und Verwandtes bei G. Keller, C. F. Meyer und Th. Storm. Leipzig, H. Haessel. 3 M.

DIEBOLD, B., Der Denkspieler Georg Kaiser. Frankfort, Verlags-Anstalt. 3 M. 20.

DÜRRER, A., H. von Gilms Weg und Weisen. Innsbruck, Verlag Tyrolia. 9 M.

ELSTER, E., F. G. Klopstock. Rede. Marburg, Elwert. 1 M. 20.

ERMATINGER, E., Wieland und die Schweiz (Die Schweiz im deutschen Geistesleben, XXI). Leipzig, H. Haessel. 1 M. 40.

ERRANTE, V., Il mito di Faust dal personaggio storico al poema di Goethe. Bologna, N. Zanichelli. L. 27.50.

Euphorion. Ergänzungsheft XVII. Grimmelshausen. Vienna, C. Fromme. 8 M. 80.

FÜLLER, F., Das psychologische Problem der Frau in Kleists Dramen und Novellen. Leipzig, H. Haessel. 2 M. 20.

GOEBEL, J., Schiller's Philosophische Briefe (*Journ. Engl. Germ. Phil.*, XXIII, 2).

GLOCKNER, H., Das philosophische Problem in Goethes Farbenlehre. Vortrag. Heidelberg, C. Winter. 1 M.

GOETHE, J. W. VON, Egmont (1788) (Deutsche Klassiker in Form und Text ihrer Erstausgaben). Berlin, Morawe und Scheffelt. 2 M. 50.

GOETHE, J. W. VON, Faust. Herausg. von E. von der Hellen. Stuttgart, Cotta. 5 M. 50.

GOETHE, J. W. VON, Gedichte. Ausgabe in zeitlicher Folge. Herausg. von E. von der Hellen. Stuttgart, Cotta. 5 M. 50.

GRÄF, H. G., Goethe. Skizze zu des Dichters Leben und Wirken. 2. Aufl. Leipzig, H. Haessel. 16 M.

GRILLPARZER, F., Werke. Herausg. von E. Castle. II–VI. Vienna, Österreich. Verlag. Each volume 102,000 kr.

HEITZ, P., und F. RITTER, Versuch einer Zusammenstellung der deutschen Volksbücher des XV. und XVI. Jahrh. Strassburg, J. H. E. Heitz. 15 M.

HETTNER, H., Das moderne Drama. Herausg. von P. Merbach (Deutsche Lit.-Denkm. des XVIII. und XIX. Jahrh., 151). Berlin, B. Behr. 4 M. 50.

KELLY, J. A., Schiller's Attitude toward England (*Publ. M. L. A. Amer.*, XXXIX, 2, June).

KOLLER, A. H., Herder's Conception of Milieu (*Journ. Engl. Germ. Phil.*, XXIII, 2).

Digitized by Google

Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

KÖRNER, J., Romantiker und Klassiker. Die Brüder Schlegel in ihren Beziehungen zu Schiller und Goethe. Berlin, Askanischer Verlag. 7 M. 50.

KORRODI, E., Schweizerdichtung der Gegenwart (Die Schweiz im deutschen Geistesleben, xx). Leipzig, H. Haessel. 1 M. 40.

KÖSTER, A., Klopstock und die Schweiz (Die Schweiz im deutschen Geistesleben, xxii). Leipzig, H. Haessel. 1 M. 40.

LÄMMLE, A., Die Volkslieder in Schwaben, I. Stuttgart, Silberburg. 2 M. 50.

LEITZMANN, A., Fischartiana (Jenaer german. Forschungen, vi). Jena, Frommann.

LERBER, H. VON, Der Einfluss der französischen Sprache und Literatur auf C. F. Meyer (Sprache und Dichtung, xxix). Bern, P. Haupt. 4 M. 80.

LIPTZIN, S., Shelley in Germany. New York, Columbia Univ. Press; London, H. Milford.

LIST, F., C. F. Meyer. Leipzig, Xenien-Verlag. 3 M.

LOCHNER, R., Grimmelshausen. Versuch einer psychologischen Persönlichkeitsanalyse (Prager Deutsche Studien, xxix). Reichemberg, Sudetandeutscher Verlag. 4 M. 50.

NADLER, J., Der geistige Aufbau der deutschen Schweiz (Die Schweiz im deutschen Geistesleben, xxii). Leipzig, H. Haessel. 1 M. 40.

NEUBURGER, P., Die Verseinlage in der Prosadichtung der Romantik (Palaestra, cxlv). Leipzig, Mayer und Müller. 12 M.

RENKER, A., G. Büchner und das Lustspiel der Romantik (German. Studien, xxxiv). Berlin, E. Ebering. 1 M. 40.

STEINWEG, C., Das Seelendrama in der Antike und seine Weiterentwicklung bis auf Goethe und Wagner. Halle, M. Niemeyer. 3 M.

STOLZE, R., Die wissenschaftlichen Grundlagen der Inszenierung von Hebbels Maria Magdalene (Hebbel-Forschungen, xiii). Berlin, B. Behr. 2 M. 50.

WEDEKIND, F., Gesammelte Briefe. Herausg. von F. Strich. 2 Bde. Munich, G. Müller. 10 M.

Digitized by Google

Original from
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Digitized by Google

Original from
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Digitized by Google

Original from
INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Digitized by Google
Original from INDIANA UNIVERSITY

ALP Collections Vault

3 0000 104 007 665

Digitized by Google

Original from
INDIANA UNIVERSITY